FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN THE HINDU POPULATION

By

D. R. BHANDARKAR

4.5
69 J

ment of Ancient Indian History and Culture,
University of Calcutta,
51|2, Hazra Road, Calcutta-19.

294.5
B469f

Reprinted from the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vol. I, Parts 1-2,
1967-68.

PREFACE

'Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population' is one of the most interesting papers produced by my teacher, the late Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture (C.U.) from 1917 to 1936. It appeared in Vol. XL (1911) of the celebrated periodical *Indian Antiquary* (1872-1933), and the candidates for the M.A. Examination in Ancient Indian History and Culture at our University have been studying it for half a century now. As a result, the relevant pages in the said volume of the journal are damaged or lost in all its copies in the libraries in Calcutta, and our students have generally to depend on copies of the paper made by them from manuscripts or typescripts borrowed from others. Unfortunately, as is quite natural, such copies are full of errors of omission and commission. Under these circumstances, we thought of reprinting the article in the *Journal of Ancient Indian History* for the benefit of our students.

The paper has been reprinted in our *Journal*, Vol. I, Parts 1-2, 1967-68, pp. 267 ff., without substantial changes, but with the addition of a few footnotes. Some misprints have been corrected without drawing the readers' attention thereto. We have now also appended to it an index prepared by Dr. A. K. Chatterjee, Junior Research Fellow at our Centre of Advanced Study.

We hope that the reprint will be welcomed by the students for whom it is primarily intended. We crave the indulgence of readers for the blemishes that may have crept into the pages.

D. C. SIRCAR,

Calcutta University,
May 30, 1968.

Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture,
and Director of the Centre of Advanced Study
in AIHC.

FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN THE HINDU POPULATION

From the orthodox point of view, the Hindu society is split up into the four main castes, viz. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. The Brāhmaṇas occupy the highest grade, because they sprang from the head of the Supreme Being; next in rank are the Kṣatriyas who were produced from his arms; after them come the Vaiśyas who were generated from his thighs; and lastly come the Śūdras who were relegated to the lowest rank as they sprang from his feet. The highest and most ancient authority that is adduced in support of this belief is the well-known *mantra* from the *Ṛgveda* (X. 90.12), which runs as follows—

Brāhmaṇo='sya mukham=āsīd=bāhū Rājanyaḥ kṛtaḥ |
urū tad=asya yad=Vaiśyaḥ padbhyāṁ Śūdro=ajāyata ||

"The Brāhmaṇa was his mouth; the Kṣatriya was made his arms; what is called Vaiśya [was] his thighs, [and] from his feet sprang the Śūdra."

The following verse from the *Manusmṛti* (I. 31) is also quoted as a further authority in favour of the belief—

Lokānān=tu vivṛddhy-arthaṁ mukha-bāh-ūru-pādataḥ |
Brāhmaṇaṁ Kṣatriyaṁ Vaiśyaṁ Śūdrañ=ca niravarttayat ||

"But, for the propagation of the worlds, he caused the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra to issue from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet respectively."

This has been the belief prevalent all over India. But, whereas in North India all these castes are generally supposed to be still extant, in South India,[1] the Brāhmaṇas and the Śūdras are regarded as the only two castes now existing, the remaining two—the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya—being supposed to have been long since extinct. Thus the *Śūdrakamalākara* says—

Brāhmaṇāḥ Kṣatriyā Vaiśyāḥ Śūdrā varṇās = trayo dvijāḥ |
yuge yuge sthitāḥ sarve Kalāv = ādy-āntayoḥ sthitiḥ ||

"The Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras are the [four] castes; the [first] three are the twice-born. All exist in every *yuga*. [But], in Kali, the first and last [only] obtain."

In order to substantiate the above doctrine, the following verses from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, Skandha XII,[2] are often quoted—

Mahāpadmapatiḥ kaścin = Nandaḥ Kṣatra-vināśakṛt |
tato nṛpā bhaviṣyanti Śūdra-prāyās = tv = adhārmikāḥ ||8
sa eka-cchatrāṁ pṛthivīm = anullaṅghita-śāsanaḥ |
śāsiṣyati Mahāpadmo dvitīya iva Bhārgavaḥ ||9

"A certain Nanda, the lord Mahāpadma, will cause the destruction of the Kṣatriyas. Thereafter the kings will be well-nigh Śūdras and impious.

"That Mahāpadma, with his commands not transgressed, will rule over the earth under one [royal] parasol, as if he were a second Bhārgava."

Here the Nanda prince, Mahāpadma, is compared to Bhārgava of Paraśurāma and is said to have destroyed the Kṣatriyas; and the kings that succeeded him are spoken of as having been Śūdras. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is thus considered as pointing to the annihilation of the Kṣatriya caste after the Nandas.

---

[1] [South and East India.—D. C. S.]

[2] [XII. i. 8-9.—D. C. S.]

But whether we regard all these four, or only two, castes as at present existing, there are numerous other castes ranging between them, which are said by the Hindu legislators to have sprung from intercourse between persons of two different castes, either by the *anuloma* or by the *pratiloma* method. The marriage of a male of any one of the four castes with a female of the lower caste is styled *anuloma*, whereas that of a man with a woman of the higher caste is called *pratiloma*. Though such marriages appear from the works on Hindu law to have once been in vogue, still the issue of such marriages was always relegated to a lower rank. It has consequently been argued that the higher castes, at any rate, of the Hindu population maintain their purity of blood to the present day and that it is only the lower castes wherein an admixture of blood can at all be supposed to have taken place. A Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya or Vaiśya has been a Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya or Vaiśya since the days of the *Ṛgveda* when the hymn, from which a verse has been cited above, was composed. Again, it is held by many that Hinduism is a non-proselytising religion, that a Hindu means an individual born of Hindu parents and not converted to Hinduism, and that, consequently, Hinduism was always a barrier to foreign races being incorporated into Hindu society.

Many will naturally, therefore, ask themselves : how can we at all talk of any foreign element contained in the higher Hindu castes ? Let us, therefore, see how far this popular belief is tenable. But let us, in the first place, see whether Sanskrit literature itself contains any statements which run counter to this view.

To an orthodox Hindu the most sacred works are, of course, the Vedas. Of these, the *Ṛgveda* is considered to be the earliest. It consists of ten parts called *maṇḍalas*. Some of these contain hymns composed by different individual *ṛṣis*. Now, who were the authors of these hymns ? Were they all Brāhmaṇas ? Most certainly not. The third *maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda* was composed by Viśvāmitra and his family, and every Hindu knows that Viśvāmitra originally was not a Brāhmaṇa, but a Kṣatriya. The authors of the fortythird and fortyfourth hymns of the fourth *maṇḍala* were Ajamīḍha and Puramīḍha. That these were Kṣatriyas will be seen from the following passage of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (IV. 19. 10)—*Bṛhatkṣatrasya Suhotraḥ | Suhotrāt Hastī ya idaṁ Hastināpuram = āropayāmāsa | Ajamīḍha-Dvimīḍha-Purumīḍhās = trayo Hasti-tanayāḥ | Ajamīḍhāt Kaṇvaḥ | Kaṇvāt Medhātithiḥ | ataḥ Kāṇvāyaṇāḥ dvijāḥ |*

Various other hymns were composed by Kṣatriyas, and this subject is no better treated than in Muir's *Sanskrit Texts*, Vol. I, to which the reader is referred. But it will be said that, although it may be established that some hymns were composed by Kṣatriyas, it does not touch the question of the admixture of blood, unless the Kṣatriyas are shown to have risen to the rank of the Brāhmaṇas. It is not, however, difficult to prove this. With regard to Viśvāmitra's change of caste, the following verse from the Anuśāsana-parvan of the *Mahābhārata* [XIII. 4.48.—D. C. S.] is worth quoting—

Tato Brāhmaṇatāṁ gato Viśvāmitro mahātapāḥ |
Kṣatriyaḥ so='py=atha tathā Brahma-vaṁśasya kārakaḥ ||

"Then Viśvāmitra of great religious austerities attained to the state of a Brāhmaṇa. Although a Kṣatriya, he became the founder of a Brāhmaṇa family."

Here then is a verse which distinctly says that Viśvāmitra was originally a Kṣatriya, but afterwards became not only a Brāhmaṇa, but the founder of a Brāhmaṇa family. This family is the well-known Kauśika *gotra*. The Brāhmaṇas of this *gotra* are as much Brāhmaṇa as the Brāmaṇas of any other *gotra*. We have thus a clear instance before us of the fusion of Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya blood. From Ajamīḍha, also referred to above, sprang Kaṇva; Kaṇva's son was Medhātithi, from whom the Kāṇvāyaṇa Brāhmaṇas descended. And yet Ajamīḍha was a Kṣatriya! Many other instances of this nature have been culled together by Muir in his valuable book, and I, therefore, refrain from adducing them here. Similarly, instances are not wanting of men of the Vaiśya caste having become Brāhmaṇas. To cite one of these, the following verse from the *Harivaṁśa* may be given—

Nābhāgariṣṭha-putrau dvau Vaiśyau Brāhmaṇatāṁ gatau /658[3]

"The two sons of Nābhāgariṣṭha, who were Vaiśyas, attained to the status of the Brāhmaṇa."

Not only men of the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya castes, but also of the lowest castes are recorded to have become Brāhmaṇas. Amongst the Brāhmaṇas of the present day, the Vasiṣṭha *gotra* is looked upon as pure as any other. The originator of this *gotra* is believed to have been the sage Vasiṣṭha, with whose name the seventh *maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda* is associated. But what was the origin of this Vasiṣṭha himself? The following verse from the *Mahābhārata* throws light on this point—

Gaṇikā-garbha-sambhūto Vasiṣṭhaś=ca mahāmuniḥ /
tapasā Brāhmaṇo jātaḥ saṁskāras=tatra kāraṇam //

"The great sage Vasiṣṭha was born of the womb of a harlot, but became a Brāhmaṇa by religious austerities. Training of the mind is the cause of it."

This account agrees with, and is probably a later development of, the tradition contained in the eleventh verse of the thirty-third hymn of Vasiṣṭha's own *maṇḍala*, i.e., the seventh *maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda*. The verse speaks of Vasiṣṭha as having sprung from Urvaśī, an Apsaras, i.e., a courtezan of the gods. Such was the vile extraction of Vasiṣṭha, and yet he was the founder of a Brāhmaṇical *gotra*, second to none in purity. A low origin is likewise attributed not only to the sage Parāśara, but also to Vyāsa, the reputed compiler of the *Mahābhārata*. A verse from the Vana-parvan of this epic says—

---

[3] [I. xi. 9.—D. C. S.]

> *jāto Vyāsas=tu Kaivartyāḥ Śvapākyās=tu Parāśaraḥ |*
> *bahavo='nye='pi Vipratvaṁ prāptā ye pūrvam=advijāḥ ||*[4]

"Vyāsa was born of a fisherwoman, and Parāśara of a Caṇḍāla woman. Many others, who were originally not twice-born, became Brāhmaṇas."

What is the upshot of these quotations? Not only the two higher castes, viz., the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, but also the lowest castes, such as fishermen and Caṇḍālas, in short, all castes and classes, have contributed to the formation of the Brāhmaṇa caste, i.e., the caste now recognised to be the highest and purest in India! Most of these quotations are taken from the *Mahābhārata* which is regarded by the Hindus as so important and sacred that it has been called the fifth Veda. And it is this fifth Veda that we have mostly relied upon for tracing some of the sources of the Brāhmaṇa caste, just referred to. Perfectly true is the Marāṭhī adage—*nadīceṁ pāhūṁ naye mūḷ āṇi ṛṣiceṁ pusuṁ naye kuḷ* (neither should the source of a river be sought for, nor the origin of the Ṛṣis be investigated).

It may be said that after all the *Mahābhārata*, from which the above passages are quoted, is a conglomeration of legends which are not of much historical importance, though they cannot be objected to by an orthodox Brāhmaṇa and consequently may be adduced to silence his preposterous pretensions to purity of origin and the consequent highest place in Hindu society.

---

[4] [Cf. *Mahābhārata*, XIII. 20. 16-19:
Adṛśyantyāḥ pitā Vaiśyo nāmnā Citramukhaḥ purā |
Brāhmaṇatvam=anuprāpto Brahmarṣitvañ=ca Kaurava ||
Vaiśyaś=Citramukhaḥ kanyāṁ Vasiṣṭha-tanayasya vai |
śubhāṁ prādād=yato jāto Brahmarṣis=tu Parāśaraḥ ||
tath=aiva Dāśa-kanyāyāṁ Satyavatyāṁ mahān=ṛṣiḥ |
Parāśarāt=prasūtaś=ca Vyāso yogamayo muniḥ ||—D. C. S.]

Let us, therefore, see what the Hindu law-books tell us, and here also I shall touch on one point only. In the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (Ch. IV) occurs this verse—

jāty-utkarṣo yuge jñeyaḥ pañcame saptame='pi vā |
vyatyaye karmaṇāṁ svāmyaṁ pūrvavac=c=ādhar-ottaram ||[5]

The translation of the first line, with which we are chiefly concerned, is this : "The exaltation of a caste in the Kali-yuga should be understood to take place in the fifth or seventh generation." The sense of it has been made lucid by Vijñāneśvara-bhaṭṭa in his celebrated commentary on this Smṛti, entitled the *Mitākṣarā*. A part of his gloss on the first line runs as follows—

vyavasthā ca Brāhmaṇena Śūdrāyām=utpāditā Niṣādī sā
Brāhmaṇen=oḍhā duhitaraṁ kāñcij=janayati | s=āpi
Brāhmaṇen=oḍhā anyām=ity=anena prakāreṇa ṣaṣṭhī
saptamaṁ Brāhmaṇaṁ janayati |

"The settled rule is [this] : a Niṣādī is produced by a Brāhmaṇa from a Śūdra female ; she (i.e., the Niṣādī), if married by a Brāhmaṇa, produces a certain girl ; even she (i.e., the girl), if married by a Brāhmaṇa, produces another [girl]—in this manner the sixth [girl] produces the seventh Brāhmaṇa [male]."

Now, what does this mean ? A Brāhmaṇa marries a Śūdra woman, and a certain female offspring is produced.

---

[5] [I. 96.—D. C. S.]

This last marries a Brāhmaṇa, and a second female offspring is produced. This last marries a Brāhmaṇa, and a third female offspring is produced, and so on. In this manner, if the sixth female offspring marries a Brāhmaṇa and has a male issue, this issue is looked upon as a Brāhmaṇa in no way differing in point of status from other Brāhmaṇas.

A verse of exactly the same import occurs in the *Manusmṛti* (X. 64) also. It is—

Śūdrāyāṁ Brāhmaṇāj =jātaḥ śreyasā cet prajāyate |
aśreyān = chreyasīṃ jātiṁ gacchaty = ā saptamād = yugāt ||

"If [a female of the caste], sprung from a Brāhmaṇa and a Śūdra female, bear [children] to one of the highest caste, the inferior [tribe] attains the highest caste within the seventh generation."

Most of the commentators of Manu interpret this verse in precisely the same manner, in which the verse from the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* quoted above has been construed by Vijñāneśvara. But there are at least two commentators who put a somewhat different, but even more favourable, interpretation on the verse. According to them, what Manu has ordained is that "if a Pāraśava, the son of a Brāhmaṇa and a Śūdra female, marries a most excellent Pāraśava female who possesses a good moral character and other virtues, and if his descendants do the same, the child born in the sixth generation will be a Brāhmaṇa."

It is idle to suppose that the Indian law-books at any rate would deal with imaginary cases regarding castes. The consensus of opinion among learned scholars is that they but record the local customs of the various parts of the country. When, therefore, Manu and Yājñavalkya lay down that the offspring of a Śūdra female from a Brāhmaṇa becomes a Brāhmaṇa in the seventh generation, only one conclusion is possible, viz., that Śūdra blood runs through the veins of the

Brāhmaṇas of the present day, if they are descendants of the Brāhmaṇas of the time of Manu and Yājñavalkya.

It is, however, the inscriptions that throw the best light on this question, and actually enable us to trace what foreign tribes were incorporated into Hindu society. As inscriptions are contemporary records, their historical accuracy cannot be questioned or their importance overrated. Indian epigraphy commences with the reign of Aśoka, the Buddhist emperor of India. In his Rock Edict XIII occur the following words—

> *ese ca mukhamute vijaye Devānaṁpriyasa yo dharma-vijayo | so ca puna ladho Devānaṁpriyasa iha ca sarvesu ca aṁtesu ā chasu pi yojana-satesu yatra Aṁtiyoka nāma Yona-rājā paraṁ ca tena Aṁtiyokena caturo rājāno Turamāye nāma Aṁtikini nāma Maka nāma Alikasuṁdaro nāma* |[6]

Here five princes are named, viz., Aṁtiyoka, Turamāya, Aṁtikini, Maka and Alikasundara. They have been universally identified with the Greek kings Antiochus Soter, king of Syria; Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt; Antigonus Gonatas, king of Macedonia; and Alexander, king of Epirus.[7] Now it is worthy of note that Antiochus is herein called *Yona-rājā*, i.e., the Yavana king. *Yavana* was, therefore, a term used in ancient times to denote the Greeks, and was perhaps, in the first instance, the Indian form of the word *Ionian*.[8] The Greeks first penetrated into India with Alexander the Great: but their supremacy about this time was short-lived, as it was completely overthrown by Candragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty, soon after Alexander's death. But though the Greeks were thus driven out of India, they maintained their power east of Persia and close to the Hindukush in the province called Bactriana, and succeeded in again establishing their sway over the Panjab and occasionally extending it as far east and south as the Jamunā and Kathiawad, when the Maurya was supplanted by the Śuṅga dynasty. One such Greek prince is referred to by Patañjali (*c.* 150 B.C.) in the well-known passages of his *Mahābhāṣya*, viz., *aruṇad=Yavanaḥ Sāketam* and *aruṇad=Yavano Madhyamikām*, which are given by him as instances of *laṅ* or the Imperfect Tense. The Imperfect Tense has thus been defined by Patañjali : *parokṣe ca loka-vijñāte prayoktur=darśana-viṣaye*, i.e., this tense is used by a person when the event described was not witnessed by him, but is known to the people, and was capable of being witnessed by him.[9] Obviously, therefore, the sieges of Sāketa and Madhyamikā by the Yavana king took place when Patañjali lived. Sāketa is generally identified with Oudh, and Madhyamikā with Nagarī, now an obscure village, six miles to the north of Citoḍ, Udaipur State.[10] Now, the Greek prince, who is identified with this Yavana conqueror, is Menander[11] who, according to Strabo, penetrated to the

---

[6] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, pp. 463-64.

[7] Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 173. [Add—'Magas of Cyrene.' Aṁtiyoka is Antiochus II Theos.—D. C. S.]

[8] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. IV, p. 245.

---

[9] [On Pāṇini, 3.2.111 (*an-adyatane laṅ*). For the Yavana invasion, see the *Yugapurāṇa* section of the *Gārgīsaṁhitā* (*JRAS*, 1963, pp. 7 ff.) —D. C. S.]

[10] Smith ; *op. cit.*, pp. 187, 189, and 204. [Read *Ayodhyā* for *Oudh*. —D. C. S.]

[11] V. A. Smith also adopts this view. But I think that the Yavana king, contemporaneous with Patañjali, was Demetrius. I hold with Percy Gardner that Menander flourished *c.* 110 B.C. (*British Museum Catalogue of Greek and Scythic Kings of India*, Introd., p. xxxiii) or perhaps even a little later. This agrees with the statement of the author of the *Periplus* (c. 89 A.D.) that the coins of Apollodotus and Menander were in circulaion in his time at Barygaza, i.e. Broach (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VIII, p. 143). This also shows that one was the immediate successor of the other and agrees with the fact that wherever the coins of Menander are found, the coins of Appollodotus are also found But the reference to the Yavana king by Patañjali shows that his conquests were ephemeral, and the Greek power certainly did not last for

'Isamus' (Jamunā) and subjugated Patalene (the Indus Delta) and Saraostos (Surāṣṭra, i.e., Kathiawad). This statement is corroborated by the curious observation of the author of the *Periplus* (*c.* 89 A.D.) that the coins of Menander and Apollodotus were current in his time at the port of Barygaza (Bharukaccha, i.e., Broach). Even to this day, his coins are found in Kathiawad in the south and as far as the Jamunā in the east. On the obverse of the coins is the legend, *Basileus Suthros Menandros* in Greek language and characters, and on the reverse the legend *Maharajasa Tradarasa Menaṁdrasa* in the Pāli language and the ancient Brāhmī characters.[12] One is the exact translation of the other. Now we have a Pāli work entitled *Milindapañha* (Queries of Milinda), in which Milinda is spoken of as a Yavana king and also as having been converted to Buddhism, after a very long and interesting discussion, by the Buddhist Doctor Nāgasena.[13] This Milinda has been commonly identified with Menander. The statement of the Pāli work is corroborated by a coin of Menander, which bears the wheel of the law (*dharma-cakra*),[14] the symbol of Buddhism, and which conjoins, with his name in the legend, the epithet *dhārmika* (i.e., *dhramika*) an essentially Buddhist expression, instead of the usual title *tradara*. So dear became Menander to the Buddhists that, according to a legend mentioned by Plutarch, no less than seven cities fought after his death for his ashes.[15]

---

two consecutive reigns. [For *Catalogue,* read *Catalogue of the Coins* and for *India,* read *Bactria and India.*—D. C. S.]

[12] Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta,* Vol. I, p. 22 ff. [The Indian script used in writing the legend is Kharoṣṭhī and not Brāhmī. Read *Basileōs Sōteros Menandrou.*—D.C.S.]

[13] Secred Books of the East, Vols. XXXV and XXXVI.

[14] *Ind. Ant.,* Vol. XXXII, p. 430.

[15] *Ariana Antiqua,* p. 283; *Ind. Ant.,* Vol. VIII, p. 337.

Let us now see how private individuals from amongst the Yavanas were disposed towards Buddhism. In inscriptions of the caves of West India, we find Yavanas frequently mentioned as making gifts in connection with Buddhist Stūpas and monasteries. In the Kārlī caves near Poona, we have the following inscriptions[16]—

1. *Dhenukākaṭā Yavanasa Sihadhayāna thaṁbho dānaṁ*, "The gift, [viz.] a pillar, of a Yavana from Dhenukākaṭa [named] Siṁhadhayya."
2. *Dhenukākaṭā Dhaṁma-Yavanasa*, "[The gift] of a Yavana [named] Dhamma from Dhenukākaṭa."

Now, these Yavanas are from Dhenukākaṭa, and the names of both are Hindu. *Siṁhadhayya* corresponds to *Siṁhadhairya*, and that *Dhamma* corresponds to *Dharma* goes without saying.

The following inscriptions[17] from the Junnar caves are also worthy of note—

1. *Yavanasa Irilasa Gatāna deyadhama be poḍhiyo*, "Two cisterns—the religious benefaction of the Yavana Irila of (i.e., belonging to) the Gartas."
2. *Yavaṇasa Ciṭasa Gatānaṁ bhojaṇa-maṭapo deyadhama saghe*, "The dining hall—the religious benefaction to the Saṅgha—of the Yavana Ciṭa of (i.e., belonging to) the Gartas."
3. *Yavanasa Caṁdānaṁ deyadhama gabhadāra*, "The door of an interior apartment—the religious benefaction of the Yavana Caṁda."

Of these Yavana names, only Irila appears to be foreign. Ciṭa corresponds to *Citra*, and *Caṁda* to *Candra*, both undoubtedly Hindu names.

---

[16] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, pp. 53 and 55. [*Sihadhayāna*=*Siṁha-dhvajānām*.—D. C. S.]

[17] *Arch. Surv. West. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 92 ff., Nos. 5, 8, 16.

There is only one Yavana inscription in the Nasik caves.[18] It runs thus—

sidhaṁ Otarāhasa Datāmitiyakasa Yoṇakasa Dhaṁmadeva-putasa Idrāgnidatasa dhaṁmātmanā imaṁ leṇaṁ, etc., "This dwelling [was granted] by the religious-souled Indrāgnidatta, son of Dharmadeva, a Yavana, a Northerner and a resident of Dattāmitra."

Now, the owner of this cave-dwelling is a Yavana, i.e., Greek. But his name is Indrāgnidatta and his father's, Dharmadeva, both decidedly Hindu names. He was a resident of Dattāmitra, a town, according to the *Mahābhāṣya*, in Sauvīra contiguous to modern Sind and supposed to have been founded by the Greek prince Demetrius.[19]

What are the facts then? The West Indian cave inscriptions give us names of certain private Yavana or Greek individuals who made gifts to the Buddhist Caityas and monasteries and consequently were unquestionably Buddhists. And not only did they embrace Buddhism, but all except one borrowed Hindu names also; in short, if the word *Yavana* had not been mentioned in these inscriptions, their foreign extraction would have remained undetected.

For a long while, antiquarians were under the impression that the Greeks had become Buddhists only and that none of them had embraced Hinduism. But this impression is now proved erroneous by the discovery of a pillar inscription, of about the second century B.C., at Besnagar in the Gwalior territory in Malwa.[20] It records the erection of a *Garuḍa-dhvaja* in honour of Vāsudeva, the god of gods, by Heliodora, son of Diya, come from king Antalikita (Antialkidas) to the court of king Bhāgabhadra. Heliodora is called a *Yavana-dūta*, i.e., a Greek ambassador, and his and his father's names, viz., Heliodora and Diya, undoubtedly correspond to the Greek *Heliodorus* and *Dion*. The very fact that he erected a *Garuḍa* column shows that, though a Greek, he had become a Hindu and a Vaiṣṇava; and if any doubt is still entertained, it is completely set at rest by the fact that he is actually styled *Bhāgavata* in the inscription.

---

[18] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII, p. 90.

[19] *Trans. Inter. Cong. Or.*, 1874, p. 345. [Kramadīśvara's *Saṅkṣiptasāra.*—D. C. S.]

[20] *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, 1909, p. 1089; *Jour Bomb. As. Soc.*, Vol. XXIII, p. 104.

So far with regard to the Yavana or Greek princes and private individuals. The Yavanas were succeeded by the Śaka kings who also were foreigners. The Imperial dynasty was reigning in the Panjab and eastern parts of Afghanistan; but their might had overshadowed the northern, central and western parts of India also.[21] The remoter provinces of the kingdom were governed by its viceroys called Kṣatrapa, i.e., Satrap, who, however, before long, succeeded in setting aside the suzerain power and declaring their independence. One such Kṣatrapa family was settled round about Takṣaśilā, the Greek *Taxila*, which was identified by Cunningham with Shāhḍherī in the Panjab, and another at Mathurā. A third held sway over Kathiawad and Malwa, and a fourth over the Deccan. Now, it is all but certain that most of the members of the imperial Śaka dynasty were Buddhists. Thus Spalirises, Azas and Moas, the second, third and sixth princes of this dynasty, and Spalahores and Spalgadames style themselves on their coins *dhramika*, i.e., *dhārmika*, an expression, which, as said above, is peculiarly Buddhistic.[22] Their coins also bear the symbol of a wheel which reminds us of the Buddhist *dharma-cakra*. Of the Kṣatrapa families, two were converts to Buddhism. The well-known Mathurā Lion-capital inscription[23] records the erection of a Stūpa over a relic of the Buddha by Nadasi-kasa, wife of the *Mahākṣatrapa* Rājūla, and the various benefactions connected therewith by the other members of his family such as Abuhola, Hayuara, Hana and so forth. The *Mahākṣatrapa* Rājūla here referred to ruled over the Eastern Panjab, North-East Rajasthan and the province round about Mathurā. There was another *Kṣatrapa* family, as I have said above, reigning at Takṣaśilā. One of the Kṣatrapas of this family, called Kusulaka, was Liaka. And a copper-plate inscription found in the Panjab describes his son Patika as raising a Stūpa over the relics of the Buddha and making a grant of land for its upkeep.

---

[21] Smith speaks of this family of kings as an Indo-Parthian dynasty, probably because some of them bear Iranic names. But if many foreign kings, as we know, adopted Hindu names, there is no wonder that some of these Śaka kings assumed Iranic names. The very fact that they have such names as Moas and Azas amongst them, which are believed to be Scythian, shows that they are Indo-Scythian, and not Indo-Parthian. Their Śaka extraction is indicated by the mention of Sakastana in the Mathurā Lion-capital inscription, made with patriotic feelings. In spite of what some scholars have said to the contrary, I maintain with F. W. Thomas (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX., p. 139) that it refers to the "country of Śakas," which perhaps in those days did not merely designate the modern Sīstān, but included the Indo-Scythia referred to by the author of the *Periplus* and Ptolemy. Gondophares' dynasty, however, was, in all likelihood, Indo-Parthian, as there is not a single Scythian name therein. I still stick to my old view regarding the order of succession of this Śaka dynasty founded by Vonones. I also stick to my view that the Mathurā date 72 of Śoḍāsa, the Taxila date 78 of Patika, the Takht-i-Bahī date 103 of Gondophares, and the Panjtar date 122 of a Guṣaṇa prince, whose name is lost, are years of one and the same era. But I am now inclined to refer them all to the Vikrama era. The dates of Kaniṣka and his successors, I would now refer to the Śaka era. This is not the place to discuss this subject; but I shall seize an early opportunity of advancing arguments in support of these views.

The other two Kṣatrapa families were, however, followers of the Brahmanic religion. I have said above that one was holding Kathiawad and Malwa and the other the Deccan. The inscriptions of this last Kṣatrapa family are found in the Nasik, Karli and Junnar caves. A part of an inscription[24] relating to them at Nasik may be quoted as follows—

---

[22] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 429. [Read 'Azes or Aja', 'Maues or Moa'.—D. C. S.]

[23] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, pp. 141 ff.

> *siddhaṁ rājñaḥ Kṣaharātasya Kṣatrapasya Nahapānasya jāmātrā Dīnīka-putreṇa Uṣavadātena trigośatasahasra-dena........ devatābhyo Brāhmaṇebhyaś=ca ṣoḍaśa-grāma-dena anuvarṣaṁ Brāhmaṇa-śata-sāhasrī-bhojāpayitrā Prabhāse puṇya-tīrthe Brāhmaṇebhyaḥ aṣṭa-bhāryā-pradena*, etc., etc.

The donor referred to in this inscription is Uṣavadāta, i.e., Ṛṣabhadatta or Vṛṣabhadatta. His wife's name, as given in another Nasik inscription, is Saṅghamitā, i.e., Saṅghamitrā. Both of these are indisputably Hindu names. But, in a third Nasik inscription, we are distinctly told that he was a Śaka.[25] His foreign origin is also indicated by the names of his father and father-in-law. The former is called Dīnīka and the latter Nahapāna, as will be seen from the inscription just quoted. It will easily be admitted that neither Dīnīka nor Nahapāna is an Indian, i.e., Hindu, name. Nahapāna again is styled a *Kṣatrapa*, and is said to be of the Kṣaharāta family. Kṣaharāta is a non-Hindu name. And *Kṣatrapa* also is not a Sanskrit word ; at any rate, it is unknown to Sanskrit literature. It is the Sanskritised form of the old Persian title *Khshathrapāvan*, which in written in English as *Satrap*. All these things unmistakably point to the alien origin of Uṣavadāta and, in particular, to his having been a Śaka, though his and his wife's names are distinctly Hindu. Now let us see what the remainder of the inscription tells us.

---

[24] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII, p. 78.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86. [Strictly speaking, 'Saṅghamitrā' is Buddhistic. —D. C. S.]

Ṛṣbhadatta is called *tri-go-śata-sahasara-da*, i.e., the giver of three hundred thousand kine. He is further spoken of as having granted sixteen villages to the gods and Brāhmaṇas. He is also stated to have furnished eight Brāhmaṇas with the means of marriage at the holy place Prabhāsa, i.e., Somnāth-paṭṭan in Kathiawad ; in other words, he incurred the merit of accomplishing eight Brāhmaṇa marriages. And, to crown the whole, he is said to have been *anuvarṣaṁ Brāhmaṇa-śata-sāhasrī-bhojāpayitṛ*, i.e., to have annually fed one hundred thousand Brāhmaṇas. This reminds us, as R. G. Bhandarkar has aptly said,[26] of the grand feast given, not many years ago, to Brāhmaṇas by the late Mahārājā Sindhia of Gwalior. These charities undoubtedly stamp Uṣavadāta as a very staunch adherent of the Brāhmaṇical religion. Yet in origin he was a Śaka and, therefore, a foreigner.

The rule of this Kṣatrapa family, called Kṣaharāta, over the Deccan did not last for a long time. It was speedily overthrown by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and his son, Vāsiṣṭhīputra Puḷumāyi, of the Śātavāhana or Śālivāhana dynasty. Another Kṣatrapa family, I have said, ruled over Kathiawad and Malwa. Its capital was Ujjayinī. It produced no less than nineteen rulers and its sway endured for no less than 270 years up to A.D. 388. The founder of this family was Caṣṭana and his father was Ghsāmotika, both indubitably foreign names. But the names of all his successors are Hindu, e.g., the son of Caṣṭana himself was Jayadāman, and his son was Rudradāman. . Though perhaps the ending *dāman* may be supposed, as Rapson says, to be the same as the suffix *dames* in such names as Spalagadames and so forth,[27] the first components such as of the Brahmanic religion. I have said above that one was holding Kathiawad and Malwa and the other the Deccan. The inscriptions of this last Kṣatrapa family are found in the Nasik, Karli and Junnar caves. A part of an inscription[24] relating to them at Nasik may be quoted as follows—

---

[26] *Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 41.

[27] *Catalogue of Indian Coins*, Introd., p. cv.

> *siddhaṁ rājñaḥ Kṣaharātasya Kṣatrapasya Nahapānasya jāmātrā Dīnika-putreṇa Uṣavadātena trigośatasahasra-dena........ devatābhyo Brāhmaṇebhyaś=ca ṣoḍaśa-grāma-dena anuvarṣaṁ Brāhmaṇa-śata-sāhasrī-bhojāpayitrā Prabhāse puṇya-tīrthe Brāhmaṇebhyaḥ aṣṭa-bhāryā-pradena*, etc., etc.

The donor referred to in this inscription is Uṣavadāta, i.e., Ṛṣabhadatta or Vṛṣabhadatta. His wife's name, as given in another Nasik inscription, is Saṅghamitā, i.e., Saṅghamitrā. Both of these are indisputably Hindu names. But, in a third Nasik inscription, we are distinctly told that he was a Śaka.[25] His foreign origin is also indicated by the names of his father and father-in-law. The former is called Dīnika and the latter Nahapāna, as will be seen from the inscription just quoted. It will easily be admitted that neither Dīnika nor Nahapāna is an Indian, i.e., Hindu, name. Nahapāna again is styled a *Kṣatrapa*, and is said to be of the Kṣaharāta family. Kṣaharāta is a non-Hindu name. And *Kṣatrapa* also is not a Sanskrit word ; at any rate, it is unknown to Sanskrit literature. It is the Sanskritised form of the old Persian title *Khshathrapāvan*, which in written in English as *Satrap*. All these things unmistakably point to the alien origin of Uṣavadāta and, in particular, to his having been a Śaka, though his and his wife's names are distinctly Hindu. Now let us see what the remainder of the inscription tells us.

---

[24] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII, p. 78.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86. [Strictly speaking, 'Saṅghamitrā' is Buddhistic. —D. C. S.]

Ṛṣbhadatta is called *tri-go-śata-sahasara-da*, i.e., the giver of three hundred thousand kine. He is further spoken of as having granted sixteen villages to the gods and Brāhmaṇas. He is also stated to have furnished eight Brāhmaṇas with the means of marriage at the holy place Prabhāsa, i.e., Somnāth-paṭṭan in Kathiawad ; in other words, he incurred the merit of accomplishing eight Brāhmaṇa marriages. And, to crown the whole, he is said to have been *anuvarṣaṁ Brāhmaṇa-śata-sāhasrī-bhojāpayitṛ*, i.e., to have annually fed one hundred thousand Brāhmaṇas. This reminds us, as R. G. Bhandarkar has aptly said,[26] of the grand feast given, not many years ago, to Brāhmaṇas by the late Mahārājā Sindhia of Gwalior. These charities undoubtedly stamp Uṣavadāta as a very staunch adherent of the Brāhmaṇical religion. Yet in origin he was a Śaka and, therefore, a foreigner.

The rule of this Kṣatrapa family, called Kṣaharāta, over the Deccan did not last for a long time. It was speedily overthrown by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and his son, Vāsiṣṭhīputra Puḷumāyi, of the Śātavāhana or Śālivāhana dynasty. Another Kṣatrapa family, I have said, ruled over Kathiawad and Malwa. Its capital was Ujjayinī. It produced no less than nineteen rulers and its sway endured for no less than 270 years up to A.D. 388. The founder of this family was Caṣṭana and his father was Ghsāmotika, both indubitably foreign names. But the names of all his successors are Hindu, e.g., the son of Caṣṭana himself was Jayadāman, and his son was Rudradāman. Though perhaps the ending *dāman* may be supposed, as Rapson says, to be the same as the suffix *dames* in such names as Spalagadames and so forth,[27] the first components such as

---

[26] *Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 41.

[27] *Catalogue of Indian Coins*, Introd., p. cv.

jaya and *rudra*, are unquestionably Hindu. About this Rudradāman, his rock-inscription at Junagadh says—

śabd - ārtha - gāndharva - nyāy - ādyānāṁ vidyānāṁ .mahatīnāṁ pāraṇa-dhāraṇa-vijñāna-prayog-āvāpta-vipula-kīrtinā,[28]

"Who has obtained profuse fame by studying and remembering, by the knowledge and practice of grammar, music, logic and other great lores."

Rudradāman thus not only bore a Hindu name but had also made himself thoroughly conversant with Hindu sciences. But he was by origin a stranger! So perfectly Hinduised these Śaka Kṣatrapa families had become that the other royal Hindu families did not think it polluting or degrading to contract matrimonial alliances with them. The Śātavāhana dynasty, whose other variant Śālivāhana is so well known to the people of Maharashtra, and whose Hindu origin is incontrovertible, was thus connected with this Kṣatrapa family. A Kaṇheri cave inscription[29] says—

...[*Vā*]*siṣṭhī-putrasya śrī-Sātakarṇṇasya devyāḥ Kārddamaka-rājavaṁśa - prabhavāyā Mahākṣatrapa - Ru*[*dra*]*-puttryā......śya-viśvasyasya amātyasya Śaterakasya pānīya-bhājanaṁ deyadharmmaḥ.*

The inscription records the gift of one Śateraka, the minister of a certain queen, whose name is lost. But she is said to have been the wife of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī-Śātakarṇi, a Śātavāhana king, and daughter of a *Mahākṣhatrapa* called Ru[dra]. This Rudra has rightly been supposed to be Rudradāman by Bühler. Here then we find that a Śātavāhana prince named Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī-Śātakarṇi, who, as shown by me elsewhere,[30] was the second son of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, the exterminator of the Kṣaharāta Kṣatrapa family, had actually been married to a daughter of the *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman. These Śaka kings had thus become so thoroughly Hindusied that another Hindu royal dynasty had no scruples whatever, social or religious, in entering into matrimonial relationship with them.

---

[28] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII., p. 44, line 13.

[29] *Arch. Surv. West. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 78.

[30] *Journ. Bomb. As. Soc.*, Vol. XXIII., pp. 72-73

Let us now see what the predilections of private Śaka individuals were. At Nasik, there are two cave inscriptions which speak of their benefactions. One is as follows—

siddhaṁ Śakasa Dāmacikasa lekhakasa Vudhikasa Viṣṇudataputasa Daśapura-vāthavasa leṇa poḍhiyo ca do.....[31]

The inscription records the gift of a dwelling cave and two cisterns by Vudhika, i.e., Vṛddhika, son of Viṣṇudatta, a Śaka and a resident of Daśapura, i.e., Mandasaur in the Gwalior State. The names Vṛdhhika and Viṣṇudatta are Hindu, and both would have passed for Hindus, if their Śaka extraction had not been specified. The other inscription[32] refers itself to the reign of an Ābhīra king called Īśvarasena, and then runs as follows—

...Śak-Āgnivarmmaṇaḥ duhitrā Gaṇapakasya Rebhilasya bhāryayā Gaṇapakasya Viśvavarmasya mātrā Śakanikayā upāsikayā Viṣṇudattayā......gilāna-bheṣaj-ārthaṁ akṣayanīvī prayuktā |

The inscription records the gift of a permanent endowment, for procuring medicine to the sick, by one Viṣṇudattā. She is called an *upāsikā*, a female Buddhist lay-worshipper. She is styled Śakānikā, and is stated to have been the daughter of a Śaka called Agnivarman. She was the wife of a Gaṇapaka Rebhila and mother of a Gaṇapaka Viśvavarman. Now, it is worthy of note that Viṣṇudattā's father is called Śaka Agnivarman. He was, therefore, a Saka. But his name, viz. Agnivarman, is distinctly Hindu, and what is strange is that, as the ending suffix *varman* shows, he was at that time looked upon as a Kṣatriya. Gaṇapaka too, like Śaka, must have been a tribal name, but we have no means of determining whether it was the name of an indigenous or foreign tribe. Being the daughter of a Śaka, Viṣṇudattā is called a Śakānikā, though married to a Gaṇapaka. This reminds us of the present Rājpūt princesses, who are known at their husbands' homes by the tribal name of their father. Thus the ruling dynasty of Jodhpur is Rāṭhoḍ; but the first queen of the present Mahārājā is styled Hāḍījī, i.e., the daughter of a Hāḍā, a sub-division of the Cohāns, to which belongs the Bundī family whence she has sprung.

---

[31] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII., p. 95.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 88. [A recently discovered inscription points to the occupation of the Ikṣvāku capital in the Nagarjunikonda valley, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh, by the Ābhīra king Vasuṣeṇa in 278 A.D. See *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 197 ff.—D. C. S.]

Almost synchronous with the Śakas were the Ābhīras, another foreign horde, which made incursions into India both south and east, and gave their name to the provinces where they settled. We have thus a tract of land in the Mirzapur District., U. P., called Ahraurā, which is a corruption of the Sanskrit *Ābhīravāṭaka*. There is another province not far from Jhānsī, doubtless called Āhīrwār after the Āhīrs established there. The Ābhīras carried the arms even so far south as the Deccan. The Purāṇas are unanimous in saying that, after the Andhrabhṛtyas, the Deccan was held by the Ābhīras, and quite in consonance with this, an inscription has been found at Nāsik which is dated in the reign of an Ābhīra king. Now, that the Ābhīras are foreigners is indubitable. Both in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and the Musala-parvan of the *Mahābhārata*,[33] they are branded as *dasyus* or banditti and *mlecchas* or foreigners, in the story which says that Arjuna, after he had cremated the dead bodies of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma in Dvārakā, was proceeding with the Yādava widowed females to Mathurā through the Panjab, when he was waylaid by these Ābhīras and deprived of his treasures and the beautiful women. But, like all other tribes, most of them soon gave up their predatory habits, though these were not altogether unknown even so late as the 9th century A.D. Thus an inscription[34] found at Ghaṭiyālā, 22 miles north-west of Jodhpur, and on a pillar erected by Kakkuka, a prince of the feudatory Pratīhāra dynasty, and dated Vikrama 918, contains the following verse :

---

[33] *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, V. xxxviii; Musala-parvan, Ch. VII.

> *Rohinsakūpaka-grāmaḥ pūrvvam = āsīd = anāśrayaḥ |*
> *asevyaḥ sādhulokānām Ābhīra-jana-dāruṇaḥ ||*

Here we are told that the village of Rohinsakūpaka, i.e., Ghaṭiyālā, had become desolate, and unworthy of habitation for the good people in consequence of the Ābhīras. The Ābhīras of the present day, however, are free from these predatory instincts. The inscription at Nāsik just alluded to, is the same as that which specifies the grant of the Śakānikā Viṣṇudattā. The first three lines of it, with which alone we are here concerned, are—

> *siddhaṁ rājñaḥ Māḍharī-putrasya Śivadatt-ābhīra-puttrasya*
> *Ābhīrasy = Eśvasenasya saṁvatsare navama 9 gimha-pakhe*
> *cauthe 4 divasa trayodaśa 13.*

This record is dated in the reign of the king Māṭharī-putra Īśvarasena, son of Śivadatta. Both Īśvarasena and Śivadatta are called Ābhīras, and yet their names are distinctly Hindu. And what is more interesting is that Īśvarasena is here called also by his metronymic, viz., Māṭharī-putra, just as all the Kṣatriyas of the time are in the cave inscriptions. At Gunda in Kathiawad, another

---

[34] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 280.

Ābhīra inscription has been found.[35] This is dated [Śaka] 102=180 A.D., and refers itself to the reign of the *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudrasiṁha, son of Rudradāman. It speaks of a grant made by the *Senāpati* or commander-in-chief of the name of Rudrabhūti, son of the *Senāpati* Bāhaka. Herein Rudrabhūti is called an Ābhīra: but his name, it need scarcely be added, is unmistakably Hindu.

The Ābhīras are, no doubt, the same as the Āhīrs of the present day, who are spread as far east as Bengal and as far south as the Deccan. Most of them are cowherds; but some have pursued other callings also, and are distinguished in some places from other persons of these callings by the distinctive appellation of Āhīr. Thus we have simple Sonārs and Āhīr Sonārs, simple Sutārs and Āhīr Sutārs and so fourth, existing side by side in Khandesh. Ābhīra Brāhmaṇas are also reported to be existing in Khandesh, Gujarat and Rajasthan.[36] The Āhīrs were such an important tribe that they gave rise to a separate dialect. Thus in Khandesh their dialect is known as Āhīrānī, which, though on the whole resembling the Marāṭhī of that District, has peculiarities of its own to such an extent as to be recognised as a separate dialect. The Āhīrs of Kathiawad and Kachh also have their own Gujarātī dialect. In olden times also, the dialect of the Ābhīras was not unknown, and it is distinctly referred to by Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyādarśa* (I. 36).

After the Śakas, the Kuṣāṇas wielded imperial power over Northern India. The first prince of this dynasty was Kujula Kadphises. In the legends of his coins, he is styled *sacadhrama-ṭhita*, i.e., *satya-dharma-sthita*. He thus appears to have been a Buddhist.[37] His successor was Wema Kadphises, who was, without doubt, a follower of the Brāhmaṇic religion, and, in particular, a devotee of Śiva. The legend on the reverse of his coins is *maharajasa rajadirajasa sarvaloga-iśvarasa mahiśvarasa Wima-Kaṭhphisasa tratarasa.*[38] Here the word *Mahiśvarasa* may possibly stand for the Sanskrit *Māheśvarasya*, i.e., "of a devotee of Maheśvara (Śiva)". But that he was a Śaiva is placed beyond all doubt by the fact that the reverse of his coins bears the image of Nandin, sometimes accompanied by a figure holding a trident and a tiger-skin, i.e., doubtless Śiva.

---

[35] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, p. 157.

[36] Wilson, *Indian Caste*, Vol. II, pp. 26, 120, 177.

[37] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 429.

He was succeeded by Kaniṣka, Huviṣka and Vāsudeva, though perhaps not of his lineage. And, though on their coins the figures of the Greek and Iranian deities are found, those of the Hindu divinities are not wanting. Thus the coins of Kaniṣka bear the figure of the Buddha, both in the sitting and standing postures. And, in fact, it is on his coins only that we, for the first time, find the Buddha actually figured. This may be regarded as evidence of the truth of what the Northern Buddhists assert as to Kaniṣka being their patron. During his regime and under his auspices, a conference of monks was convened to settle the Buddhist canon again, and it was at this time that the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism assumed a definite form. On the coins of his successors occur the figures of Skando (Skanda), Mahaseno (Mahāsena), Komaro (Kumāra), Bizago (Viśākha)[38a] and Oesho (Śiva)—all from the Brāhmaṇic Pantheon. That these Kuṣāṇa kings are foreigners is indisputable. The names Kujula Kadphises, Wema Kadphises, Kaniṣka and Huviṣka by no means sound Indian. Numismatists are at one in saying that the costume of these kings, as determined from their coins, is Turkish and their features Mongolian. And yet we find them doing homage to the Hindu divinities !

---

[38] Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, p. 68.

[38a] [Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. xii. Read *Maaseno.*—D. C. S.]

The well-known Maga or Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas[39] must be assigned to about this period. A stone inscription of Śaka 1059 = 1137-38 A.D. has been found at Govindpur[40] in the Nawada Sub-Division of the Gaya District, Bengal, which begins with the following stanza, descriptive of this community—

Devo jīyāt = trilokī-maṇir = ayam = Aruṇo yan-nivāsena puṇyaḥ
Śākadvīpas = sa dugdh-āmbunidhi-valayito yatra vipre Mag-ākhyāḥ |
vaṁśas = tatra dvijānāṁ bhrami-likhita-tanor = Bhāsvataḥ sv-āṅga-muktaḥ
Śāmbo yān = ānināya svayam = iha mahitās = te jagatyāṁ jayanti ||

"Hail to that gem of the three worlds, the divine Aruṇa, whose presence sanctifies the milk-ocean-encircled Śāka-dvīpa, wherein the Brāhmaṇas are named Magas ! There a race of twice-born [sprang] from the Sun's own body, grazed by the lathe,[41] whom Sāmba himself brought hither. Glorious are they, honoured in the world !"

But a detailed account of these Magas is given in the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*.[42] Therein they are said to have sprung from the union of Sūrya and Nakṣubhā, daughter of the sage Ṛjihva, belonging to the Mihira-gotra. The account here is rather involved and not quite lucid. But the main points are clear enough. She had a son named Jaraśabda according to one manuscript, but Jaraśasta according to another. He was the originator of the Maga Brāhmaṇas. They were originally dwelling in Śāka-dvīpa, but were brought to Jambu-dvīpa, it is said, by Sāmba, son of Kṛṣṇa. Sāmba was suffering from white leprosy, and Nārada advised him to erect a temple of Sūrya on the river Candrabhāgā in order that he might be cured of his disease. This was accordingly built;[43] but no Brāhmaṇas undertook to perform the duties of Pujārīs. Thereupon, on the advice of Gauramukha, Sāmba set out for Śāka-dvīpa and brought ten Maga families. Various details of these Brāhmaṇas are further given. But it is sufficient here to note that they were also called Bhojaka and that they wore round their waist what is called an *avyaṅga* which was originally the skin of the serpent-god Vāsuki.

---

[39] Weber has written a learned paper on the Magas ; but I am sorry to say that it has been a sealed book to me as I do not know German and could not induce anybody to translate it for me.

[40] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II., p. 330 ff. [The Gaya District now forms a part of the State of Bihar.—D.C.S.]

[41] Cf. *bhrami-likhita-tanor°* of the text with *Śākadvīpe bhramiṁ kṛtvā rūpaṁ nirvartitaṁ mama* of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, Brahma-parvan, 129. 13.

[42] Brahma-paravan, Chs. 139-42. In some MSS, instead of Nakṣubhā we have Nikṣubhā, and instead of Ṛjihva, Sujihva or Ṛjvāhva. So also some MSS have Jalagambu or Jaraśabda instead of Jaraśasta.

A little reflection will tell us that these Magas are no other than the Magi of old Persia, who were the priestly class there. The name of their originator, we have seen, was Jaraśasta which bears a close correspondence in sound to Jarathustra (Zoroaster). *Avyaṅga* again is the Indian form of the Avestic word *aiwyāōnghen*. The *gotra* of the grandfather of Jaraśasta, as we have seen, is Mihira, which again is the Sanskritised form of Old Persian *Mihr*.

We have already seen that the Magas are mentioned in the Govindpur stone inscription of 1137 A.D. But an earlier epigraphic reference to them is to be found in the Ghaṭiyālā inscription of Kakkuka dated Vikrama 918 = 861 A.D. The text of the inscription is therein said to have been drawn up by the Maga Mātṛravi. Varāhamihira (*c.* 505 A.D.), in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* (IX. 19), speaks of the Magas as the proper persons to install and consecrate the image of Sūrya. To about this time (550 A.D.) belongs the manuscript found in Nepal, in which it is said that, in the Kali-yuga, the Magas and Brāhmaṇas would be regarded as of the same status.[44] Again it is worthy of note that a short account of Śāka-dvīpa, together with its population including the Magas, occurs in the *Mahābhārata*, Bhīṣma-parvan, Ch. XI.[45] This may be an interpolation; but it must be remembered that the epic acquired its present character by about 450 A.D.[46] and, consequently, the Magas must be supposed to have come into India before the middle of the fifth century. I think that they came with Kaniṣka[47] (*c.* 78 A.D.) who appears to have been the first Indo-Scythian prince that had espoused the Avestic faith.[48] What is specially noticeable in this connection is that it is on his coins that the name and figure of the deity Mihira for the first time are met with. Mihira, a form of the god Sūrya, was the *gotra* name of Ṛjihva, grandfather of Jaraśasta, and is even now an epithet borne by many

---

[43] Candrabhāgā is the river now called Chenab, and the temple was built at Mūltān, one of whose names is Sāmbapura; the place, where the image was installed, is called Mitravana in the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*. For further details, see Cunningham's *Ancient Geography of India*, Vol. I, pp. 232 ff.

---

[44] *Proceedings of the Bengal Asiatic Society*, 1902, p. 3.

[45] The same verses are repeated in the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, Brahmaparvan, 139. 74 ff.

[46] According to Macdonell, the epic acquired its present character by about 350 A.D. (*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 287). But the mention of Hūṇa in it requires us, I think, to assign it to 450 A.D.

[47] I have now come to regard that Kaniṣka, in all likelihood, flourished about this time and that he was the originator of the era which was afterwards known at Ṣaka-kāla.

[48] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 89 ff.

Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas. The Magas, in all probability, first came to India with Kaniṣka as his Avestic priests.

Such was the origin of the Maga Brāhmaṇas. Yet how thoroughly they have imbibed Hindu faith and literature! The Govindpur inscription, referred to above, speaks of one Gaṅgādhara as having built a tank. He was also the composer of the inscription. He gives us a short description of his relatives, from which it appears that his was a poets' family. His father, Manoratha, is styled Nūtana-Kālidāsa, and his grandfather Cakrapāṇi is compared to Vālmīki. Many others are praised more or less for their poetic talents. His is not a mere empty praise, because they were his relatives; for the work *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205 A.D.) of Śrīdharadāsa, an anthology culled chiefly from Bengal poets,[49] makes mention of no less than six of them (including him) and cites their verses also. Nay, Varāhamihira, one of the most celebrated astronomers of India appears to have been a Maga Brāhmaṇa. Bhaṭṭ-Otpala, who has commented on his works, tells us that he was a Magadha Brāhmaṇa.[50] *Magadha* here does not, I think, mean an inhabitant of Magadha, but a Maga himself. The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* distinctly tells us that *Magaṁ dhyāyanti te yasmāt tena te Magadhāḥ smṛtāḥ.*[51] This is corroborated by his and his father's names, viz., Varāhamihira and Ādityadāsa, one of whose components is a name of Sūrya.

In the Jodhpur State, there is a class of Brāhmaṇas known as Sevak and also Bhojak, most of whom are religious dependents of the Osvāl Śrāvaks. They call themselves Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas, and keep images of Sūrya in their houses, which they worship on Sundays, when they eat once only.[52] Formerly they used to wear a necklace resembling the cast-off skin of a serpent, no doubt corresponding to the *avyaṅga*, which was supposed to be the cast-off skin of Vāsuki. But this practice has recently fallen into desuetude.[53] The Parāśarī Brāhmaṇas of Pushkar were also originally known as Sevaks and Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas. At any rate, they were so known till the time of the Jaipur king Jayasiṁha II.[54] The Sevaks say that their caste people are called Śākadvīpī in the east, Sītāpatrī in the south, and Paṇḍe round about Delhi and Agra. The Pujārīs of the temples of Jagadīśa and Jvālāmukhī in North India are, it is said, Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas.

---

[49] *Zeit. Deut. Morg. Ges.*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 511.

[50] Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. II., p. 477, note.

[51] Brahma-parvan, 117. 55.

After the overthrow of the Kuṣāṇas, the Haihayas poured into India. The *Harivaṁśa* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*[55] state that they seized the kingdom of the indigenous Indian king Bāhu and that they were assisted in this expedition by the Śakas, Yavanas, Pāradas, Kāmbojas, Pahlavas and Khasas. Bāhu retired to a forest and killed himself. One of his wives, who was pregnant at that time, went to the hermitage of Aurva Bhārgava, and was there delivered of a son called Sagara. The latter, in course of time, learnt the use of various miraculous weapons from the sage, and made a fearful slaughter of the Haihayas. He then turned his arms against the Śakas, Yavanas, etc.; but the sage Vasiṣṭha intervened, and Sagara had to content himself with depriving them of the true religion and degrading them as Kṣatriyas. Now, as the Haihayas are here classed with the Śakas, Yavanas Pāradas, Kāmbojas and so forth, there can be little doubt that they were regarded as *mlecchas*, i.e. foreigners, at about the close of the fourth century A.D., when the *Harivaṁśa* was composed. It does not seem difficult to determine which part of India they held. In the Anuśāsana-parvan of the *Mahābhārata* and also in the *Harivaṁśa*,[56] we are informed that the thousand-armed Haihaya king Kārtavīrya-Arjuna reigned over the whole earth from Māhiṣmatī, which, I think, has been rightly identified by Fleet with Māndhātā on the Narmadā in the Nimar District.

---

[52] *Census Report of the Jodhpur State* (Hindi), 1891, Vol. III, pp. 320 ff.

[53] This information I received from Munshi Deviprasad of Jodhpur.

[54] I owe this information to Pandit Gaurishankar Ojha of Ajmer.

[55] *Harivaṁśa*, I. 13-14; *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, IV, 3. 16 ff. [From the Historical Section of the Purāṇas, the Haihayas, unlike the Kalacuris, do not appear to be foreigners.—D.C.S.]

The Kalacuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur, in many of their inscriptions, call themselves, Haihayas and trace their lineage to Kārtavīrya.[57] They were probably a sept of the Haihayas. Their power, however, does not date earlier than *circa* 875 A.D. A branch of this family went to Western India, and established itself at Kalyāṇī, under the leadership of Bijjala, by supplanting the Cālukya dynasty.[58]

This is seen from the fact that the formal preambles of their records always style them "lord of Kālañjara, the best of towns." Kālañjara is unquestionably the celebrated hill-fort of Kāliñjar in the Banda District (Bundelkhand), U. P., in the very heart of the territory of these Kalacuris. But the earliest Kalacuri family, of which records have been found and which appears to be an imperial dynasty, was that ruling over the Nasik and Khandesh Districts, Gujarat and Malwa, and reigning in all likelihood at

---

[56] Anuśāsana-parvan, 153. 3; *Harivaṁśa*, v. 1868.

[57] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 263; Vol. II, p. 5; vide also *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, pp. 253, 268.

[58] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I., Pt. II, pp. 225 ff. and 468 ff.

Māhiṣmatī. One copper-plate grant of this dynasty has been found at Abhona in the Nasik District, and is dated in the year 347 (595 A.D.) in the reign of the Kaṭaccuri king Śaṅkaragaṇa.[59] The grant was issued by the Kalacuri prince when he was at Ujjayanī. Another, discovered at Sarsavni[60] in the Pādrā Sub-Division of the Baṛodā State, is dated in the year 361 (609-10 A.D.), and refers itself to the reign of Buddharāja who is no doubt the same as the Kalatsuri prince of that name represented in the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription to have been defeated by the Cālukya prince Maṅgaleśa.[61] Besides the Kalacuris, there appear to be some chieftains, at any rate in Southern India, who were known simply as Haihayas. Thus in the time of the Later Cālukya prince Someśvara I, one of his feudatories was the *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Revarasa, with the title of "Lord of Māhiṣmatī, the best of towns", and described as belonging to the family of Kārtavīrya.[62] During the regime of the Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI, a portion of the Nizam's Dominions round about Kammarawadi was governed by his feudatory Yānemarasa, with the title of "Lord of Māhiṣmatī, the best of towns", and belonging to the Ahihaya-vaṁśa.[63] Similarly, a feudatory of the Cālukya sovereign, Perma-Jagadekamalla II, was one Revarasa with the same title and pertaining to the same family.[64] The Ahihaya-vaṁśa, here referred to, must undoubtedly be the same as Haihaya, as is clearly proved by the mention of Māhiṣmatī, the old capital of the Haihayas.

---

[59] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, pp. 297 ff.
[60] *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, pp. 297 ff.
[61] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 17-18.
[62] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. II, p. 439.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 451.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 457.

All the records of the Kalacuri dynasties, whether of Cedi, Ratanpur or Gujarat-Malwa, are dated in an era of their own. This era is also employed by princes of other dynasties such as the Uccakalpa, Traikūṭaka[65] and so forth, who were in all probability their feudatories. The epoch of this era is 249 A.D., when, therefore, the power of the Haihayas must be supposed to have been firmly established. The legends of Paraśurāma freeing the earth of the Kṣatriyas are too well-known to be repeated here. But, if we read between the lines, we find that he bore a grudge only against the Haihayas, with whose slaughter he was chiefly concerned. Paraśurāma is, in the *Mahābhārata*, represented as residing in the Mahendra mountain, and, in the *Harivaṁśa*, in the Sahya. And if there is a grain of truth in the legends, what they perhaps imply is that Paraśurāma, or some Brāhmaṇa hero in the South, put an effectual stop to the further incursions and encroachments of the Haihayas who wanted to occupy Southern India.

Traces of the name Kalacuri are still found amongst the Marāṭhās[66] and Rājpūts of the Central Provinces. The Kāyastha Prabhus[67] of Maharashtra at any rate claim descent from Sahasrārjuna. There is a sept of the Sūryavaṁśī Rājpūts in Bihār called Harihobans,[68] who appear to be the same as Haihayavaṅś. There are Hayobansas also in U. P.[69]

After the power of the Kuṣāṇas was overthrown and that of the Guptas established, India enjoyed respite for about two centuries. It was during the first half of the 6th century that the Hūṇas penetrated into India with the allied tribes, viz. Gurjaras, Maitrakas and so forth, eclipsed the Gupta power, and occupied Northern and Central India. The two Hūṇa sovereigns, whose names have been preserved, are Toramāṇa and his son Mihirakula.[70] Both these names are non-Indian. Mihirakula no doubt apparently looks like a Hindu name, but is, in reality, the Sanskritised form of the Persian *Mihrgul*, "Rose of the Sun".[71] We do not know whether Tormāṇa had become a Hindu ; but certain it is that Mihirakula had become a convert to Hinduism. On some of his coins we have, on the reverse, a bull—the emblem of Śiva—with the legend *jayatu Vṛṣaḥ*, "victorious be the Bull".[72] Again, in a Mandasaur inscription, he is said to have bent his neck to none but Śiva.[73] This is an unmistakable indication of his having become a Hindu and adopted the worship of the god Siva. When he was defeated and driven out of North and Central India by the conjoint effort of Narasiṁhagupta Bālāditya in the east and Yaśodharman in the west, he, according to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, retired to Kashmir, established an empire there, and was the founder of the family, Hūṇa of course, which for long held that country and were staunch adherents of Brāhmaṇism.

---

[65] The Traikūṭakas were probably not feudatories (as they seem to have struck coins), but were a sept of the Haihayas, like the Kalacuris. [The Uccakalpa kings apparently used the Gupta era.—D.C.S.]

[66] Birje, *Who are the Marathas?*, p. 108.

[67] *Bombay Gazeteer*, Vol. XIII, Pt. I, p. 87.

[68] Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 317.

[69] Elliot, *The Races of the N.-W. Provinces of India*, Vol. I, p. 128.

That the Hūṇas are White Huns or Ephthalites and consequently foreign barbarians is incontrovertible. And yet, as early as the 11th century, they had come to be regarded as Kṣatriyas ; and an inscription informs us that a Cedi king Yaśaḥkarṇa married a Hūṇa princess of the name of Āhalladevī. The Hūṇas have become so thoroughly Hinduised that they are looked upon as one of the thirty-six Rājpūt families believed to be genuine and pure. But so far as my inquiries go, they have no longer any separate existence as a clan like the Cavāṇs, Pavārs and so forth. Hūṇa is nowadays found only as a family name in the Panjab, or as the name of a sub-division of such castes as Rebhārī.[74]

---

[70] Fleet, *Gupta Inscrs.*, pp. 159, 162.

[71] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 75, note 6.

[72] Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, p. 236.

[73] Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

I have stated above that another foreign horde that came into India with the Hūṇa was the Gūjar, which has been Sanskritised into Gurjara or Gūrjara. The modern province of Gujarāt in the Bombay Presidency and the Districts of Gujarāt and Gujarānwālā in the Panjab are no doubt called after the Gūjars, who came and settled there. The name Gujarāt is not a corruption of *Gurjara-rāṣṭra* as is too commonly supposed, but of *Gurjaratrā.* In inscriptions of about the 9th century, found near Jodhpur, a province called Gurjaratrā is mentioned, and the Daulatpurā copper-plate grant of Bhoja I and a Kālañjara inscription enable us to infer that it embraced at least the modern Districts of Ḍiḍwānā and Parbatsar of the Jodhpur State.[75] A fourth Gujarāt (i.e. Gurjaratrā) is mentioned by Al-Bīrūnī (A.D. 970-1031).[76] To the south-east of Kanauj, he says, lay Guzarāt, the capital of which was Bazāna also known as Nārāyan, which is identified with Nārāyaṇpur in the north-easternmost part of the Jaipur territory. In fact, the Gūjars still abound in this part of Jaipur, and the southern portion of the Alwar State. And this province was no doubt in old days held by a dynasty named Gurjara Pratīhāra, as is shown by an inscription found at Rājor.[77] Therein Mathanadeva, a prince of this family, is represented to have granted the village of Vyāghrapāṭaka to the god Lacchukeśvara named after his mother Lacchukā. The fields of this village, it is said, were cultivated by the Gurjaras, which shows that the Gūjars had occupied and settled in that country in the 10th century at the latest. But it was in Western Rajasthan that they appear to have established themselves first. For, as informed by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang who came to India in the earlier part of the seventh century, that part of Rajasthan was known as the Kiu-che-lo (i.e., Gurjara) country, with its capital at Pi-lo-mo-lo, i.e., Bhinmāl in the Jaswantpurā District, Jodhpur State.[78] Hiuen-tsang tells us that the king was looked upon as a Kṣatriya. This is interesting because it shows that as early as the first half of the seventh century, i.e., about a century after their coming into India, the Gūjars had become Hindus and actually acquired the rank of Kṣatriyas. About the middle of the 8th century, they had extended their supremacy far beyond Rajasthan, carried arms as far eastward as Bengal, and established themselves at Kanauj. They are commonly styled as the imperial Pratīhāra dynasty. They have been called 'Juzr kings' by the Arab travellers and writers, Abu Zaid, Al Masudi and others, and are spoken of as constantly fighting with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the South.[79] This agrees with the allusions to the Gurjaras made in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records. If any further proof is needed to show that the Pratīhāras were

---

[74] *Census Report of the Jodhpur State* (Hindi), 1891, Vol. III, p. 570.

[75] *Journ. Bomb. As. Soc.,* Vol. XXI, pp. 414-15.

[76] Sachau, *Alberuni's India,* Vol. I, p. 202; *Bombay Gazetteer,* Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 520. [Cf. Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.,* pp. 160 ff. —D. C. S.]

---

[77] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 266.

[78] Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, p. 270; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 63.

[79] *Journ. Bomb. As. Soc.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 422-24.

Gūjars, it is supplied by the phrase Gurjara-Pratīhāra itself, occurring in the Rājor inscription just referred to. The phrase must, of course, be interpreted to mean "the Pratīhāras who were Gurjaras." There can, therefore, be no doubt that the imperial Pratīhāra dynasty, reigning at Kanauj, was of the Gūjar race.

The Gūjars are still found in numbers in the Panjab, U.P., Rajasthan and Central India, but mostly as cultivators or cowherds. In the north-west of the Panjab, however, they are still "a purely pastoral and almost nomad race, taking their herds up into the higher ranges in summer and descending with them into the valleys during the cold weather."[80] The Gūjars are not, however, found in Gujarāt of the Bombay Presidency, though there are unmistakble indications of this tribe having been merged into the Hindu population there. Thus, we have Gūjar and simple Vaṇiās (traders), Gūjar and simple Sonārs (goldsmiths), Gūjar and simple Kumbhārs (potters), and Gūjar and simple Salāṭs (masons).[81] The first-mentioned of these castes are Gūjars who, taking to different callings, have formed separate castes. The Gujarāt Kaṇbīs or husbandmen are divided into the main sections, Lewās and Kaḍwās, and though here the name Gūjar has not survived, there can be little doubt that they belong to the Gūjar stock. For the husbandmen of Khandesh belong to two main divisions, local and Gūjar Kuṇbīs. The latter include eight classes, two of which are these Lewās and Kaḍwās. There is also a Brāhmaṇa caste called Gūjar-Gauḍ, the members of which are found principally in Rajasthan. The conjoint name Gūjar-Gauḍ means, I think, Gauḍ Brāhmaṇas of the Gūjar race, i.e.,

---

[80] Ibbetson, *Census of the Panjab*, p. 263.

[81] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 4.

Brāhmaṇas of Gūjar extraction originally settled in Gauḍa, which does not here denote Bengal but the province round about Ṭhāṇeśvar, as first pointed out by A. M. T. Jackson.[82] Amongst the Rājpūts, the word Gūjar has survived in the name Baḍ-Gūjar (Bīrgujar) of a clan, which is one of the thirty-six royal families looked upon as pure and genuine in Rajasthan.[83] Gūjar is still the name of a Marāṭhā family, which was once famous in the modern history of Maharashtra. This name is also to be found among the Karhāḍā Brāhmaṇas. James Campbell has said that "the commonness of the name Gurjara among Karhādes shows that it is something more than a special surname held by the descendants of individuals employed in Gujarāt, and the fact that the surname is common on the coast, especially in the Rājāpur Sub-Division and is rare in Dakhan families, and that, where it occurs, it can, in most cases, be traced to a connection with the Konkan, all support the view that the Karhāde Brāhmaṇas of Ratnāgiri are largely of Gūjar origin."[84] The earliest record in which this surname has been traced is a copper-plate grant in the possession of a Karhāḍā family in the Koṅkan and surnamed Gurjara. The name of the grantee is therein thus given—

---

[82] *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, 1905, pp. 163-64. For long it was a puzzle to me how the Gauḍ Brāhmaṇas, who abound in the Jaipur State and form one of the sub-divisions of the great Gauḍa, as distinguished from the Drāviḍa, stock, came to be so called, especially as no legends in any way connected them with Bengal. The puzzle is now solved by Al-Bīrunī's "Guḍa-Tāneshar", to which our attention was drawn by A. M. T. Jackson. But it must be remembered that it was the tribe Gauḍa that gave this name to the province and not *vice versa*. For we have not only Gauḍ Brāhmaṇas, but Gauḍ Rājpūts in Central India. This points to Gauḍa having originally been a stranger tribe, which was afterwards merged into the Hindu Society. [Cf. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 120 ff.—D. C. S.]

[83] Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Lahiri & Co. ed., Vol. I. pp. 109-10.

[84] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. IX, Pt. I, p. 498.

> *Udadhi-taṭa-varti-Kauṁkaṇa-deśe Kāśyap-Āvatsāra-Naidhruv-eti-tri-pravar-opeta-Nidhruva-gotr-otpanna-Gurjara-samupābhidhāna-Goviṁda-paṭṭavardhana-haste*, etc.[85]

The donee here is Govinda, surnamed Gurjara and Paṭṭavardhana. The date of the grant is 1191 A.D., i.e. to say, no less than 700 years have elapsed since the charter was issued. That the Karhāḍās came from the North may be shown in another way also. Two of their surnames are Ojhe and Rāwat, corresponding to Ojhā and Rāut found in Gujarāt and Rajasthan, but nowhere in Maharashtra.

So far with regard to the names of Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya families, in which the word Gūjar is not found, but which nevertheless are of Gūjar origin. Such, e.g., was originally the imperial Pratīhāra dynasty of Kanauj, as shown above. And yet how thoroughly they had become Hinduised! Not only did they borrow Hindu names, such as Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa, Rāmabhadra and so on; but they also adopted the various Hindu faiths. Thus, whereas some style themselves *parama-vaiṣṇava*, i.e. devout worshippers of Viṣṇu, others call themselves *parama-māheśvara*, i.e., devout worshippers of Śiva, or *parama-bhagavatī-bhakta*, i.e., ardent devotees of Bhagavatī or Pārvatī.[86] Nay, what is more, two of these kings, viz., Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla, who were the patrons of the poet Rājaśekhara, are in his plays actually called *Raghu-kula-tilaka* (ornament of the race of Raghu), *Raghu-grāmaṇī* (the leading person of Raghu's family), etc., etc.[87] So that by the time of Rājaśekhara, the Gūjar kings had not only adopted the Brāhmaṇic mode of worship, but also traced their descent from an epic hero. They, however, traced their origin not to Rāma, as one is apt to presume, but to his younger brother Lakṣmaṇa who, it is said in a Gwalior inscription, was called Pratīhāra from his act of repelling (*pratiharaṇa-vidheḥ*) the enemies in in his battle with Meghanāda.[88] Here Pratīhāra is derived from *prati* plus *hṛ*, to repel, and as this *pratiharaṇa* is spoken of as having been achieved in a battle with Meghanāda, the word *pratihāra* cannot be taken in the usual sense of "door-keeper". But, at other places, we are told that, because the function of a door-keeper (*Pratīhāra*) to Rāmabhadra was performed by Lakṣmaṇa, the family came to be known as Pratīhāra.[89] This discrepancy is enough to show that the account is fabulous, and the connection with Lakṣmaṇa was concocted when the Pratīhāras were settled and perfectly Hinduised in India and were in dire need of carrying back their genealogy to some epic hero, in order to pass off their dynasty as a genuine indigenous one. The true origin appears to be that given in a Jodhpur inscription of the feudatory Pratīhāra family. Therein we are informed that there was a Brāhmaṇa named Haricandra and surnamed Rohilladdhi, that he had two wives, one a Brāhmaṇa and the other a Kṣatriya woman, and that the children from both were called Pratīhāras, those from the first being styled Brāhmaṇa Pratīhāras and those from the second Kṣatriya Pratīhāras. This is not a merely traditional account, for in the same inscription that describes the exploits of the Pratīhāra chieftain Bāuka, we are distinctly told in verse 27 that, in his fight with king Mayūra, he was assisted by the Brāhmaṇa Pratīhāras as well as the Kṣatriyas. The marriage of a Brāhmaṇa with a Kṣatriya woman, with the result, as related in this inscription, is curious and can only be accounted for as being of foreign importation. The Smṛtis, no doubt, allow a Brāhmaṇa to marry a Kṣatriya woman ; but the offspring of such a union is relegated to the class of mixed castes and has nowhere therein been styled Kṣatriya, as appears from the inscription to have been the case with these Pratīhāras.

---

[85] *Prabhās* for Āṣāḍha-Āśvina, Ṣaka 1829. This copper-plate grant seems to have been known to A. M. T. Jackson (vide *Bombay Gasetteer*, Vol. IX, Pt. I, p. 498, note 3).

[86] For these epithets indicative of their religious predilections, see, e.g., *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 211-12. That Bhagavatī in these epithets signifies Pārvatī has already been shown by me in *Prog. Rep. Archaol. Survey, West. Circle*, 1907-08, p. 47.

---

[87] V. S. Apte, *Rājaśekhara : his Life and Writings*, p. 9 ; Konow and Lanman, *Rājaśekhara's Karpūramañjarī*, pp. 178-79.

[88] *Archaeol. Surv. Ind.*, An. Rep., 1903-04, p. 280, verse 3.

[89] *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, 1894, pp. 4 ff.

The modern representatives of the Pratīhāras are the Paḍihārs who form one of the four *agnikulas*, i.e., fire-sprung tribes. In fact, Pratīhāra is only the Sanskritised form of Paḍihār. The Paḍihārs are found in Rajasthan, Panjab and Bihar.[90] But no trace has yet been found of the Brāhmaṇa Pratīhāras referred to in the Jodhpur inscription. It is, however, worthy of note that among the Pokarṇā Brāhmaṇas of the present day, there is a *khāṁp* or sub-division called Paḍiyāriyā.[91] May not the Pokarṇās of this *khāṁp* be the descendants of the Pratīhāra Brāhmaṇas of the inscription ?

The second Rājpūt tribe, which is, in all likelihood, of Gūjar origin, is Cālukya or Caulukya. There is no epigraphic evidence in the present case ; but there can be no doubt that Gujarāt of the Bombay Presidency bore this name only after the Caulukyas conquered and occupied it. If the Caulukyas had not been of Gūjar extraction, it is inconceivable how that province could have been named Gujarāt (Gurjaratrā), when it was up till their advent known as Lāṭa[92]

---

[90] Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, pp. 93-94; Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, Vol. II, p. 165.

[91] *Census Report of the Jodhpur State* (Hindi), 1891, Vol. III, p. 159.

There were two hordes of this tribe which emigrated at two differen periods. The first came forth in the last quarter of the sixth century from the Savālakh mountains, as I shall show further on, spread as far south as the Madras Presidency, and was generally known by the name Cālukya. The second emigrated about the middle of the tenth century from Kalyāṇakaṭaka, i.e., Kanauj, but did not go south beyond Gujarāt. It was generally known by the name of Caulukya or Solaṅkī. Some antiquarians are of opinion that they do not represent one tribe, as the first swarm of the invaders was called Cālukya and the the second Caulukya. But this view, I am afraid, has not much ground to stand upon. Because, the first have been called also Caulukya in several manuscripts of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* by Bilhaṇa, the *Vidyāpati* of Vikramāditya VI of the Cālukya family reigning at Kalyāṇī. The same Bilhaṇa again speaks of the Solaṅkī sovereigns of Gujarāt as Cālukya in his play entitled *Karṇasundarī*.[93] There, therefore, seems to be no reason to hold that they were two different tribes. Like the Kadambas, as we shall see further on, the Cālukyas are represented as Hārītīputras, as of the Mānvya-gotra and as meditating on Ṣaḍānana and the seven Divine Mothers. This indicates their Brāhmaṇa, and rather priestly, origin, though we cannot perhaps say that they and the Kadambas belonged to one tribe. In their later records the Cālukyas are spoken of as originally having been at Ayodhyā; but I shall soon show that they really emigrated from the old Sapādalakṣa country, which was in the Himalayas.

---

[92] *Journ. Bombay As. Soc.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 425-26. [For the Calukyas and the Agnikula myth, see Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, pp. 17 ff.; *The Classical Age*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 227 ff.—D. C. S.]

[93] *Karṇasundarī* (Kāvyamālā Series), p. 5, verse 20; also p. 52, verse 15.

The Cālukyas are at present represented by the Solaṅkīs in Rajasthan, by the Cālkes and Sālunkes in the Marāṭhī-speaking Districts,[94] and by the Calhuks in Bihar.[95]

Like the Paḍihārs, the Solaṅkīs are also regarded as an *agnikula*, i.e., fire-sprung tribe. The remaining two are the Cāhamānas and the Paramāras. This legend about the *agnikula* is first narrated in the *Pṛthvīrājarāsā*, a work of doubtful authenticity. So far as the inscriptions go, it is only the Paramāras who can claim to be an *agnikula*. Wherever, in their records, an account of their origin is given, there their progenitor is invariably represented as having arisen from the *agnikuṇḍa* or fire-altar of Vasiṣṭha on Mount Abu. But not a single epigraphic record of the Pratīhāra, Cālukya or Cāhamāna family has been found, in which their origin from the fire-altar is even so much as hinted at.

I have just shown that the Pratīhāras and Caulukyas were of the Gūjar race. We do not know to what stock the Paramāras belonged, though it is certain that they were of foreign extraction. Evidence can, however, I believe, be adduced in support of the foreign origin of the Cāhamānas. "There are found in North-Western India coins of the Sassanian type and fabric bearing inscriptions in Nāgarī, Sassanian Pahlavī, and an alphabet, hitherto unread, which is probably a development of the modified form of the Greek alphabet used by the Scytho-Sasssanians. These have been sometimes attributed to the later Hūṇas, but apparently without sufficient reason. They were almost certainly struck by some Sassanian dynasty or dynasties—as is shown by the style of the coins and by the use of Sassanian Pahlavī—ruling over Sind and Mūltān which the earliest Arab geographers include in the kingdom of Sind. It may be noticed that the region had at other periods been in the hands of the Persian conquerors. For one of these issues, which has the name *Śrī Vāsudeva* only in Nāgarī characters and all the remaining portion of its legends is Sassanian Pahlavī, an approximate date is fixed by its very near resemblance to a coinage issued by Khusrū II Parvīz in the thirtyseventh year of his reign = 627 A.D."

---

[94] Birje, *Who are the Marathas ?*, pp. 106, 110.

[95] Risley, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

The above passage has been extracted from Rapson's *Indian Coins.*[96] The Nāgarī legend referred to by him consists of two parts, one *Śrī-Vahmana* to right and the other *Vāsudeva* to left.[97] There is another type of this king's coins, the legends on which are important. On the obverse, the legend is in Sassanian Pahlavī and reads *Saf Varsu Tef = śrī-Vāsudeva* in the inner circle to right, and, on the margin, *Saf Varsu Tef — Wahman × Multān Malkā,*[98] meaning 'Śrī-Vāsudeva-Vahmana, king of Mūltān'. On the reverse, we have *Śrī-Vāsudeva* in Nāgarī characters and the Pahlavī legend, *Tukān Ẕāulistān Sapardalakshān* = Ṭakka, Zabulistān and Sapādalakṣa.[99]

Now, who was this Vāsudeva Vahmana, reigning from Mūltān over India, Zabulistān and Sapādalakṣa? The word *Vahmana* is commonly taken to be equivalent to *Bahmana*, and Vāsudeva is consequently supposed to have reigned at Bāhmanwāsi = Brāhmaṇābād in Sind.[100] But

---

[96] See pp. 30, § 109.

[97] *N. Chron.*, 1894, p. 290.

[98] *Ibid.*, pp. 292-93.

[99] See note 124 below.

[100] *N. Chron.*, 1894, p. 268; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 30, § 109.

Vahmana does not here stand as the name of a city or province. We have just seen that, on one type of Vāsudeva's coins, we have simply *Śrī-Vahmana* and *Vāsudeva.* Here *Śrī* is prefixed to *Vahmana,* but never to Tukān, Zāulistān or Sapardalakshān. Again, there is no such word as *malkā* here to denote that Vāsudeva was the ruler of Vahmana. It is therefore natural to conclude that Vahmana must here be the name of the family or tribe to which Vāsudeva belonged. And this name we easily obtain by reading the word as *Cahmana* or *Cāhmāna,* and not *Vahmana.* The letters *v* and *c* in old days were so close to each other that one might easily be mistaken for the other. In fact, the first letter of the name has actually been read *c* by Cunningham, though he is, of course, wrong in reading the next two letters as *ngāra* or *ndāra.*[101] There can, therefore, be no doubt as to *Cahmana* being the correct reading. *Cahmana,* it need scarcely be said, stands for *Cāhamāna* ; and what the legend on the coin means to say is that Vāsudeva was a Cāhamāna. Now, it is worthy of note that the work entitled *Pṛithvīrājavijaya* says that the first prince of the Cāhamāna family was Vāsudeva who obtained the gift of the salt-lake, which he placed under the protection of the goddesses Āśāpurī and Śākambharī.[102] The same is stated in the colophon of Rājasekhara-sūri's *Prabandhakoṣa* which contains a list of thirtyseven kings belonging, it is said, to the Sapādalakṣīya-Cāhamāna-nṛpa-vaṁśa i.e., to say "the Cāhamāna royal family of the Sapādalakṣa country."[103] This list too begins with "Rājā Vāsudeva", for whom the date Vikrama 608 is also specified. It is, therefore, in every way reasonable to hold that Vāsudeva Cāhamāna of the coins is identical with Vāsudeva, the first king of the Cāhamāna dynasty. But the date Vikrama 608 = 551 A. D. assigned to him by the *Prabandhakoṣa* is rather early, and the proper date to be assigned to him appears to be 627 A.D., concluded from one type of his coins being an exact copy of that of Khusrū II Parvīz, as mentioned above. Cunningham held that Vāsudeva was a later Hūṇa; but Rapson is of opinion that he was a Sassanian. Probably he was a Khazar, and this would also adequately explain, I think, why some legends on his coins are Sassanian Pahlavī. But, this much is incontrovertible that Vāsudeva was of foreign blood, and consequently the Cāhamāna family to which he pertained was also a foreign tribe.

---

[101] *N. Chron.,* 1894, p. 290.

[102] *Vienna Or. Journ.,* Vol. VII, p. 190.

[103] Hultsch, *Reports of Sk. Mss. in South Ind.,* No. III, p. 114.

The next earliest prince of this dynasty was Sāmanta, with regard to whom the Bijoliā inscription says that he was a Brāhmaṇa (*vipra*), belonged to the Vatsa-gotra and came originally from Ahicchatra.[104] This shows that Ahicchatra was the original habitat of the Cāhamānas and that they were Brāhmaṇas.[105] That is to say, they originally belonged to some priestly class of foreign tribes. Like the Guhilots of Mewar, who were originally Nāgar Brāhmaṇas, they exchanged their priestly for martial pursuits, and were afterwards merged into the Kṣatriya caste.

It is on the supposition that they were Brāhmaṇas that the poet Rājaśekhara's marriage with a Cāhamāna lady becomes intelligible. In his *Karpūramañjarī*, we are informed that his wife was Avantisundarī, "the chaplet of the Caūhāṇa (Cāhamāna) family". On the other hand, the facts that his surname was Yāyāvara, and that he styled himself *Upādhyāya* or *Guru* of Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla-Vināyakapāla shows that he was a Brāhmaṇa. He, therefore, could marry Avantisundarī, only if the latter were of the Brāhmaṇa family. Later on, however, their Brāhmaṇic origin was forgotten and, instead of as belonging to the Vatsa-gotra, they were regarded as having sprung from the eye of Vatsa Ṛṣi.[106]

---

[104] *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.*, Vol. LV, Pt. I, p. 41, verse 12; Kaviraj Syamaldas, who edited this inscription, has wrongly read *Vipra-śrī-Vatsagotre-='bhūd°*. The original stone, which I inspected in 1905, clearly has *Vipraḥ Śrī-Vatsa,°* etc. The estampage, which I had then prepared with my own hand and consulted before writing this note, supports this reading.

[105] Cf. also the expression *dīkṣita-Vāsudevaḥ* of the *Hammīra-mahākāvya*, I. 27.

Like the Cāhamānas were the Kadambas who were also originally Brāhmaṇas, but became Kṣatriyas afterwards. The very fact that, in their copper-plate inscriptions, they are styled Hārītīputra and Mānavyasagotra is enough to show that they were of Brāhmaṇa origin. But this matter is now set beyond all doubt by the Talagunda inscription, the earliest record of their family.[107] Therein we are told that "there was a high family of the twice-born (*dvija*) in which Hārītīputras trod the path of the three Vedas, and which had sprung from the *gotra* of Mānavya, the foremost of Ṛṣis" and that these Brāhmaṇas (*vipra*) were called Kadamba, because they tended a *kadamba* tree near their house. In this family arose Mayūraśarman who, being enraged at the oppressions of a Pallava king on the Brāhmaṇas, fought with them and wrested from them a portion of their territory.

The name Mayūraśarman here is noteworthy, for he is no doubt identical with Mayūravarman, the name of their ancestor specified by the later records of the Kadambas. The Talagunda inscription, however, attaches to his name the honorific suffix *śarman* which is affixed to the names of Brāhmaṇas only. This also shows that Mayūraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba dynasty, was a Brāhmaṇa. But what is very strange is that his very son is in the same inscription called Kaṅgavarman, that is, with the title *varman* assumed by Kṣatriyas. Be that as it may, the Brāhmaṇic origin of the Kadambas remains indisputable.

---

[106] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 74.

[107] *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 31 ff.

I have stated above that, like the Kadambas, the Cālukyas also are known as Hārītīputra and Mānavyasagotra. They must have been somehow intimately connected with each other. There can be no question that the Cālukyas came from the north. The Kadambas also, therefore, seem to have emigrated from the same quarter. This also explains, I think, how the son of Mayūraśarman became a Kṣatriya. What actually happened in the case of the Pratīhāras must have occurred here also. The custom of the offspring of a Brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya woman being called Kṣatriya, which the Pratīhāras followed, though not a Hindu custom, appears to have been followed by the Kadambas also, as will be shown subsequently. This also indicates the northern and foreign origin of the latter.

A stone inscription at Kargudari, in the Hangal Taluka of the Dharwar District, represents this Mayūraśarman, or Mayūravarman (I) as he is therein called, as three-eyed and four-armed, as a son of the god Śiva and the Earth, as having "bound his infuriated elephants to a shining pillar of a rock of crystal of [the mountain] Himavat," and as having brought from Ahicchatra eighteen Brāhmaṇas whom he established in the Kuntala country. Another Talagunda record[109] speaks of Mukaṇṇa-Kadamba, "the three-eyed Kadamba", supposed to be identical with Mayūraśarman as having brought twelve thousand Brāhmaṇas of thirtytwo *gotras* purified by performing the

---

108 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, pp. 251, 253.
109 *Ep. Carnat.*, Vol. VII, Pt. I, p. 121.

Agnihotra sacrifice, from the *agrahāra* of Ahicchatra, and as having established them in the *agrahāra* of Sthāṇugūḍhapura, i.e., Talagunda itself in the Shimoga District, Mysore. The Brāhmaṇas brought here from the north are said to have made an effort later to leave the province. "But they were brought back again, and, in order to prevent a repetition of the attempt, were compelled to have unshorn a lock of hair on the forehead, as a distinguishing mark. From these are descended the present Haiga or Haviga Brāhmaṇas of the north-west of Mysore, who wear their hair in that fashion. Ethnologically, their colour and features support the tradition of a northern origin."[110]

Another foreign tribe, which came from the north to the south, is Sinda. An interesting record of this family has been found at Bhairanmaṭṭi[111] in the Bāgalkoṭ Taluka, Bijapur District, Bombay Presidency. It says that there was a Sinda prince named Pulikāla, born in the race of the Nāgas, who had the *nāga-dhvaja* or hooded-serpent banner, and the hereditary title *Bhogāvatīpura-parameśvara*, i.e., "supreme lord of the town of Bhogāvatī", which was, according to Hindu mythology, the capital of the Nāga king Vāsuki in Pātāla or the lower regions. From a desire to see the earth, there came from these regions the serpent-king Dharaṇendra, and to him there was born at Ahicchatra in the island of the river Sindhu (the Indus), a son, "the long-armed Sinda", the progenitor of the Sinda family. The Sindas thus were a clan of the Nāga tribe, and came from Ahicchatra.

---

[110] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg*, p. 26. The Haviga Brāhmaṇas of Kārwār still say that they were originally brought by Mayūravarman (*Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. XV, Pt. I, p. 117) ; cf. also Da Cunha, *Sahyādrikhaṇḍa*, p. 334.

[111] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 232. [Cf. Sircar, *Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 137-38.—D. C. S.]

We have seen that Sāmanta, one of the earliest princes of the Cāhamāna dynasty, came from Ahicchatra. Mayūraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba family, we know, proceeded to the Himalayas, and brought with him a colony of Brāhmaṇas from Ahicchatra. The implication is that Ahicchatra was somewhere in the Himalayas. The ancestor of the Sindas also, we now find, came from Ahicchatrapura. Ahicchatra thus appears to be the original habitat, in India, of these foreign tribes, before they migrated southward or eastward. This Ahicchatra is no doubt identical with O-hi-chi-ta-lo of the Chinese traveller Hiuen-tsang.[112] Cunningham has identified this place with Rāmnagar, about 22 miles north of Badāun, in U. P.[113] But this identification does not seem to be correct, as Hiuen-tsang distinctly states that the country of Ahicchatra "is naturally strong, being flanked by mountain crags". This description does not at all suit the position of Rāmnagar which is on the Gangetic plains and is not surrounded by hills. On the contrary, it perfectly agrees with what we are told in the Kadamba and Sinda inscriptions, viz., that it was in the Himalayan range. The Jain works[114] also mention one Ahicchatra as the capital of Jāṅgala which, in the *Mahābhārata*,[115] is once placed near Mādreya situated between the Chenab and the Sutlej.[116] The Jāṅgala (i.e., jungly) country near Mādreya, can only be in the southern part of the Himalayas, where Ahicchatra must consequently be located. To speak more clearly, there appear to have been at least three Ahicchatras in Northern India. One, as seems from the *Mahābhārata*,[117] was to the north of Pañchāla. And this may now be represented by the ruins near Rāmnagar, as Cunningham says. It may also be the Adisdara (for *Adisadra*) of Ptolemy which was in the Prasiake,[118] i.e., the Prācya, country. The second was Adeisathra[119] of the same Greek geographer, which must have been in the Adeisathroi territory, though, curiously enough, he disjoins one from the other. This, I think, is the same as the Adhichhatra of a Pabhosā inscription.[120] The third, as just shown, was in the Himalayas, is to be identified with Hiuen-tsang's O-hi-chi-ta-lo, and was probably the only Ahicchatra flourishing in the mediaeval times.

---

[112] Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. I, p. 200

[113] *Ancient Geography of India*, Vol. I, pp. 359 ff.

[114] Weber, *Die Sk. und Pr. Handschriften der Berliner Bibliothek*, pp. 562, 854.

[115] Bhīṣma-parvan, 9. 39; see also verse 56 of the same *parvan*, and Udyoga-parvan, 54. 7.

[116] Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, Vol. I, p. 185.

Now, the question arises: what was originally the name of this mountainous territory? The southernmost limit of it was formed by what is called the Siwalik (properly Sawālakh) range. At present it is supposed to run parallel to the Himalayas for about 200 miles from the Beas to the Ganges. But, in the olden days, it must have covered a far wider region. Two inscriptions found at Gayā mention one Aśokavalla as the lord of the kings of the Sapādalakṣa mountains and as the overlord of a tributary named Puruṣottamasiṁha of the Kāma, i.e., Kamāun, country.[121] Another inscription of this king has been found in Gaḍhwāl. A reference to these hills is found also in the Mughal emperor Bābur's autobiography. Munshī Devī Prasād of Jodhpur informs me that, according to Bābur's account, this range commences with the Indus and runs through many parts of Kashmir, such as Pakhli and Sahmanak. The same hills are called Hindukush in Kabul, and, after turning a little southward, run straight off to the east. This range, says Bābur, was called Sawālakh, because it contained no less than 125,000 hills. This whole hilly region must, therefore, widely speaking, be supposed to have been originally known by the name of Sapādalakṣa; but in particular it included the Districts of Kamāun, Gaḍhwāl, Kāṅgḍā, Hoshiārpur and so forth—in fact, all that part of India between the Chamba State and Nepal. As foreign inroads extended southwards, it embraced also a portion of the sub-montane region along this line. This also explains how, with the migration of the Cāhamānas southward, the boundaries of Sapādalakṣa came to be extended or rather the country over which they ruled came to be called Sapādalakṣa. It has been stated above that Rājaśekhara-sūri, author of the *Prabandhakoṣa*, speaks of them as Sapādalakṣīya-Cāhamāna, i.e., Cāhamāna of the Sapādalakṣa [country]. From inscriptions, and the early Muhammadan writers, it seems that Sapādalakṣa included Hānsi in the Panjab, Ajmer, Maṇḍor, the old capital of Marwar and 6 miles north of Jodhpur, and Maṇḍalgaḍh in Mewar.[122] All this was exactly the territory held by the Cāhamānas, and there cannot be even the shadow of a doubt as to this province being called Sapādalakṣa only after their occupation. And what can be more natural than that they should give it the name of their original habitat? How else are we to explain again the fact that the District of Dharwar over which a branch of the Cālukya family ruled was known as Sapādalakṣa, as the author of the *Pampa-Bhārata*[123] informs us? Here too only one conclusion is possible. The original habitat of the Cālukyas, like that of the Cāhamanas, was the mountain region called Sapādalakṣa, and they too gave this name to the territory which they conquered in the south, though it was far removed from the Himalayas. Thus the mountainous territory called Sapādalakṣa was the original country where the Cāhamānas and Cālukyas were settled. It is with this Sapādalakṣa that the Sapardalakshān of Vāsudeva's coins, referred to above, must be identified, and not with Rajasthan, as is done by Cunningham, because Northern Rajasthan came to be called Sapādalakṣa about the middle of the eleventh century, and was, in the time of Vāsudeva, known as Gurjaradeśa only.[124] In this connection, it is

---

[117] Ādi-parvan, 138. 76-77. On the strength of this *adhyāya*, it is asserted that Ahicchatra was the capital of North Pañcāla. But this is not actually borne out. Ahicchartra is here called the capital, not of North Pañcāla, as it would have been stated if it had really been so, but of Ahicchatra-viṣaya. In fact, North Pañcāla or Pañcāla proper was the country between the Ganges and the Jamunā. This agrees with what Rājaśekhara says in the *Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa*, Act V, verse 86.

[118] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 352-53; vide also the *Kāśikā* on Pāṇini I. 1.75 where both Ahicchatra and Kānyakubja are included in Prācya.

[119] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIII, p. 361.

[120] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 361.

[121] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, pp. 342-46; *Journ. Bomb. As. Soc.*, Vol. XVI, p. 358.

---

[122] *N. Chron.*, 1894, p. 271. There can be no doubt that the kingdom of the Cāhamānas was called Sapādalakṣa. At the end of his work, entitled *Dharmāmṛta*, Āśādhara says that he was in the fortress of Maṇḍalākara, situated in the country of Sapādalakṣa, the ornament of which was Śākambharī (R. G. Bhandarkar's *Report* for 1883-84, p. 390). Śākambharī is no doubt Sāmbhar, the capital of the Cāhamāna kingdom. Sapādalakṣa here can, therefore, denote the Cāhamāna territory only. This Sapādalakṣa included, as Āśādhara

---

informs us, Maṇḍalākara-durga, i.e., Maṇḍalgaḍh in Mewar. This was, I think, its south-eastern limit. A Ladnu inscription informs us that it included Nāgapattana, i.e. Nagaur, and I have elsewhere stated that there is still a tract of land in the Nagaur District, known as Svālakh or Savālakh, which is famous for bullocks. This formed its western boundary. How far its other boundaries extended is not clear. In this connection, it may be stated that the last story of the first *tantra* of the *Pañcatantra* speaks of Sapādalakṣa and also Pallipura (Pāli), but in such a way as to show that Pāli did not fall under Sapādalakṣa, at any rate, at the time when the work was composed.

[123] Rice, *Pampa-Bhārata* (Bibliotheca Carnatica), "Analysis of the poem," p. 1. My attention to this was drawn by R. Narasimhachar of Bangalore. [See Sircar, *Geog. Anc. Med. Ind.*, p. 204.—D.C.S.]

[124] The names of the countries that occur on the coins of Vāsudeva are Tukān, Jāulistān and Sapardalakshān. Cunningham's identification

worth noticing that the so-called White Hun coins in the collection of Rawlins, so ably and lucidly noticed by V. A. Smith, came from the Plateau of Manaswāl situated on the outer range of the Sawālakh hills in the Hoshiarpur District.[125] In fact, this whole mountainous region had been occupied by the Hūṇas and Gūjars before they spread southward and eastward.

Not only the fighting tribes such as the Cāhamānas, Cālukyas and Sindas, but also Brāhmaṇas came from Ahicchatra, the capital of old Sapādalakṣa. We have seen above that Mayūraśarman, the founder of the early Kadamba family, brought twelve-thousand Brāhmaṇas of thirtytwo *gotras* from this place, and some of these, at any rate, are represented by the modern Havigas. The *Keralotpatti* tells us that the Brāhmaṇas in the South were brought by Paraśurāma from Ahicchatram.[126] In inscriptions as well as in the colophons of old MSS, Brāhmaṇa grantees or authors originally of Ahicchatra are mentioned. Thus the Ujjain plates of 974 A.D. speak of the grantee Vasant-ācārya as having emigrated (*vinirgata*) from Ahicchatra, i.e., belonging to the Ahicchatra Brāhmaṇa community.[127] Mahīdhara, author of the *Mantramahodadhi*,

---

of Jāulistān with Jābulistān is incontrovertible. But Sapardalakṣān is to be identified, as I have just shown, not with Rajasthan, but with the mountanious region comprising Kamāun, Gaḍhwāl, Kāṅgḍā, Hoshiārpur and so forth. Tukān has been identified by Cunningham with the Panjab (*N. Chron.*, 1894, p. 269), but without sufficient grounds On some coins instead of Tukān we have Takān. Again, the ending *ān* is here tautologous like that in Sapardalakṣān. The true name thus appears to be Ṭāk-Ṭakka, doubtless, the name of the province between the Indus and the Beas known as early as the eighth [7th—D.C.S.] century (Stein, *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, trans., Vol. I, p. 205, note 150). Tukān, i.e., Ṭakkadeśa, thus was contiguous with the old Sapādalakṣa.

[125] *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, 1907, p. 91.

[126] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VII, p. 281.

[127] *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, pp. 50, 52.

speaks of himself as having emigrated from the territory of Ahicchatra which he calls *dvija-cchatra*, i.e., shelter of the twice-born.[128]

Linguistic considerations also lead us to the same conclusion. There is a group of languages called Pahāḍī, which, as Grierson tells us, are offshoots of Rājasthānī.[129] They are spoken in the Himalayas from Chamba in the Panjab to Nepal. Grierson, however, accounts for this close resemblance by saying that bands of Rājpūts at various times invaded these hills, settled there and intermarried with the original inhabitants, on whom they imposed their language. I am not aware of any evidence that can be adduced to show that the Rājpūts, who conquered the hills, were from Rajasthan (Rajputana) as he, I think, clearly implies. On the contrary, what little I know runs counter to this view. For the Rājpūt tribes known in Rajasthan are Cāhamānas, Pàḍihārs and so on ; but those which exist in the hilly Districts of the Panjab are Katoch, Pathania, Jaswal,[130] etc., quite unheard of in Rajasthan. On the other hand, the principal Rājpūt tribes of Rajasthan have themselves come, as I have just shown, from this hilly country, which was in olden times known as Sapādalakṣa. The Cāhamānas and the early Cālukyas came from this region and the Bhāṭīs also appear to have come from here, for they have a subdivision amongst them called Sawālakhiā, which is found even among the Bhāṭī Mālis.[131] There may be many other Rājpūt clans, such as the Paramāras and Paḍihārs, who also came from

---

[128] Aufrecht, *Oxford Catalogue*, p. 100.

[129] *Imperial Gazetteer*, Vol. I, pp. 364, 368.

[130] Ibbetson, *Census of the Panjab*, 1881, pp. 248-51.

[131] *Census Report of the Jodhpur State* (Hindi), 1891, Vol. III, p. 89. Sawālakhiā is also a *khāṁp* among the Baid-Kāyasthas (*ibid.*, p. 404).

Sapādalakṣa, although we know nothing about them just now in this respect.

The close resembance between Rājasthānī and Pahāḍī has, therefore, to be explained by the fact that the predominant tribes of Rajasthan, who alone could influence Rājasthānī, themselves came from the hilly tracts where Pahāḍī is spoken. In this connection it deserves to be further noticed that another offshoot of Rājasthānī, as Grierson informs us, is Gūjarī, "the language of the Gūjars wandering with their herds over the mountains of Kashmir and the Swat valley." This doubtless connects the principal Rājpūt tribes of Rajasthan, who have influenced Rājasthānī, with the nomadic Gūjar race, a conclusion by no means startling. These tribes are what are called the *agnikulas*, i.e., Cāhamānas (Cavāns), Paramāras (Paṁvārs), Caulukyas (Solaṅkīs) and Pratīhāras (Paḍihārs). The Solaṅkīs and Paḍihārs we know for certain to be of Gūjar origin. And, though no proof can as yet be actually brought forward, there is every likelihood of the Cavāns and Paṁvārs also being Gūjars. With regard to the Cāhamānas (Cavāns) in particular, we have seen above strong evidence in support of their foreign origin. I believe that, as legend has brought these four Rājpūt tribes together and classed them under *agnikula*, they all came from Sapādalakṣa and were of Gūjar race.

That the Gūjars were foreigners has now been admitted on all hands. They have been identified by James Campbell[132] with the Khazars who occupied a very prominent position on the borderland of Europe and Asia especially in the sixth century A.D. It is worth noticing here that the Khazar is called Gazar to the north of the sea of Asof, that Ghyssr is the name for the

---

[132] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. IX, Pt. I, pp. 471 ff.

Khazars who have become Jews, and that *Ghusar* is the form of *Khazar* in use among the Lesghians of the Caucasus.[133] All these forms, i.e., *Gazar*, *Ghyssr* and *Ghusar* approach so closely the Indian name *Guza(ja)r*, that it would be well-nigh impossible to dissent from James Cambell's view. Reminiscences of their immigration to India are preserved in the names of the various provinces called after them. Thus, in the first place, we have a tract of land called Gurjistān, apparently in the neighbourhood of the White Hun capital Badeghiz.[134] A modern trace seems to remain in Ujaristān, the initial *g* being dropped, beyond Arghandāb, west of Hazārā. A third Gujaristān is near Ghanzī. There are other provinces named after them, which are too numerous to mention. But the three instances I have here given are sufficient to show that the Gūjars were originally outside India. Now, ethnologists of repute are of opinion that the Khazars, though perhaps not of the same stock as the White Huns, were certainly most intimately connected with them.[135] This explains why the advent of the Gūjars was almost synchronous with that of the Hūṇas in India. The earliest mention of Gurjara occurs in the Aihole inscription, Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* and Hiuen-tsang's itinerary,[136] which are practically of the same period, i.e., the first half of the seventh century. But then the Gūjars had been so firmly settled in Rajasthan that this last was called Gurjaradeśa after them. And it would be interesting to know whether they were known duly by this name even at the time when they entered India. In Chapter XIV of his

---

[133] *Ibid.*, p. 472.

[134] *Ibid.*, p. 478.

[135] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XIV, article on 'Khazar'.

[136] *Journ. Bomb. As. Soc.*, Vol. XXI, p. 425.

Bṛhatsaṁhitā, Varāhamihira places a tribe called Kacchāra in conjunction with Hūṇa in the northern division of India.[137] It need scarcely be said that Kacchāra comes so close to Khazar that it seems extremely tempting to hold that one is an Indian form of the other. An Ephthalite coin, found in the old Sapādalakṣa, which has been described by V. A. Smith, has on the obverse [*Khi*]*jara* and on the reverse *Śrī-Prakāśāditya.*[138] *Khijara* here is doubtless a mistake for *Khajara*, another Indian form of *Khazar*; and the coin shows that Prakāśāditya was a Khazar by race. In Southern India have been found inscriptions of certain chiefs, who are therein described as of the Jīmūtavāhana lineage and of the Khacara race.[139] Thus Kacchāra, Khacara, Khajara and Gurjara are all names denoting one tribe just as we have the names Cāhamāna, Cohān, Cavhān, Cavān and Chāhamā for the family to which the celebrated Pṛthvīrāja belonged. "The Khazars were fair-skinned, black-haired, and of remarkable beauty and stature; their women indeed were sought as wives equally at Byzantium and Baghdad."[140] This satisfactorily answers, I think, those who maintain that there is no admixure of foreign or aboriginal blood in the Brāhmaṇas or Rājpūts simply because they are fair and clear-featured.

We now come to the Maitraka clan. For long, it was thought that the Maitrakas were the enemies of Bhaṭārka, the founder of the Valabhī dynasty. But the correct interpretation of the passage wherein they are mentioned requires us to suppose that they were the tribe to which Bhaṭārka belonged.[141] I have elsewhere said that Bhaṭārka is to be placed *c.* 500 A.D., i.e., exactly the time when the might of the Hūṇas had overshadowed Northern India. I have little doubt that they entered into India with the Hūṇas. I have also said that the Maitrakas were the same as Mihiras, the well-known tribe of Mers, as in Sanskrit both Mitra and Mihira mean the same thing, viz., the sun. This itself is enough to stamp the Valabhī dynasty as originally foreign barbarians. In consonance with this view is the fact that the name Bhaṭārka and perhaps the name of his son Dharasena are hardly indigenous or Hindu, but have all the look of being the Sanskritised forms of foreign names. And it is, no doubt, these princes who brought from the north the word *divira* in *divira-pati*, which occurs in their copper-plate charters, but is a Persian word. With the Maitrakas are closely associated the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas; at any rate, they make their appearance first during the regime of the Valabhī dynasty. Vallabhji Haridatt Acharya of Rājkoṭ has kindly supplied me with a verse which sets forth what are called the *śarmans* (i.e., name-endings) of the various *gotras* of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. It has been found by him in three MSS of the work *Pravarādhyāya* connected with the Nāgars. One of the MSS is dated Saṁvat 1788, Vaiśākha-sudi 8, Bhṛgu, and all distinctly state that the *gotras*, *pravaras*, etc., therein specified are those which were in existence before Saṁvat 1283. This verse, which is of great importance, runs as follows—

---

[137] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXII, pp. 172, 179. The Khacaras also are mentioned by Varāhamihira further on in this list. But here the word has to be translated with Fleet by "the roamers in the sky," as they are placed between the Keśadharas and Śvamukhas.

[138] *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, 1907, p. 96.

[139] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 439, 443, 450, 452, 476, 523.

[140] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XIV, p. 59.

> *Datta-Guptau Nanda-Ghoṣau Śarma-Dāsau ca Varmā ca |*
> *Nāgadattas = Trāta-Bhūtau Mitra-Devau Bhavas = tathā ||*

---

[141] In my paper on the 'Guhilots' (*Jour. Beng. As. Soc.*, 1909, p. 183), I have given credit to Hultzsch for having first proposed this inter-

Here is a list of thirteen *śarmans* which were in use amongst the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas nearly 700 years ago. Even now they are affixed to their names, when they perform the religious ceremonies. Here, however, we are concerned with three of them, just to show that the list is not a fiction, but has some foundation in fact. These three *śarmans* are Mitra, Trāta and Datta.

In the *Pravarādhāya*, Mitra has been assigned to two *gotras*, viz. Śārkarākṣa and Gāṅgyāyana. In my paper on the Guhilots, I have given extracts from three copper charters, all found at Alīnā,[142] in which the names of the Brāhmaṇa grantees as well as of their fathers end in *mitra*. Here then we have three instances of the Mitra *śarman*. That they were Nāgar Brāhmaṇas is clearly proved by the fact that they all originally belonged to and came from Ānartapura or Ānandapura, which is identical with Vaḍnagar. And the *gotra* of these donees, as given in the copper-plates, is Śārkarākṣi, the same as Śārkarākṣa, specified in the *Pravarādhyāya*. The latter again gives for the Trātā *śarman* the *gotras* Bhāradvāja and Ātreya. Let us see whether this also is borne out by any inscription. The Vavadiya-jogia plates[143] of Dhruvasena I, dated Gupta-Valabhī 221, speak of the grantees thus :

> *Anandapura-vāstavya-Brāhmaṇa-Skandatrāta-Guha-trātābhyāṁ Chandoga-sabrahmacāribhyāṁ*, etc., etc.

The name Ānandapura shows that the grantees here also were Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. Their names, it is worthy of note, end in *trātā*, and both are of the Bhāradvāja-gotra,

---

pretation; but I now find that, as a matter of fact, Fleet was the first to suggest it (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VIII, p. 303), though he afterwards gave it up (*Gupta Inscrs.*, p. 167).

[142] *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.*, 1909, pp. 181-82.

[143] *Vienna Or. Journ.*, Vol. VII, p. 299.

which thus perfectly agrees with the information contained in the *Pravarādhyāya* about this *śarman.*

Another Valabhī grant[144] has the following—

> *Ānandapura-vinirggata-Vallabhi-vāstavya-traividya-sāmānya-Gārgya-sagotra-adhvaryu-Brāhmaṇa-Kikkaka-putra-Brāhmaṇa-Magopadatta*, etc., etc.

Here also the donee is a Nāgar Brāhmaṇa, as he is said to have emigrated from Ānandapura. His name is Magopadatta which ends in the *śarman* Datta, and his *gotra* is Gārgya, which agrees with the *Pravarādhyāya*, the last giving no less than nineteen *gotras* for this *śarman*, of which Gārgya is undoubtedly one.

It is thus evident that the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas figure first in the time of the Valabhī princes and that the same *śarmans* that are now, were even then, current amongst them. Now, the question arises : what can these *śarmans* be ? They cannot possibly be in all cases mere name-endings. For the name-endings that we generally meet with are the names of gods such, e.g., in Maṇiśaṅkar, or some terms descriptive of being devotees of those gods, such, e.g., in Ambādās. But in the present list, most of them, such as Nanda, Varman and so forth, are certainly neither of them. On the contrary, even a moment's reflection will convince us that no less than ten of these thirteen *śarmans* are found as family names among the Kāyasthas in Bengal, corresponding to Datta, Gupta, Nandī, Ghoṣa, Śarmā, Dās, Barmā, Bhūt, Mitra and Deb.[145] And, of these, the names Gupta, Varman and Mitra are by no means unfamiliar to Indian epigraphy as those of royal families.

---

[144] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XI, p. 309.

[145] Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, Vol. II, Appendix, pp. 74-75.

Several coins have been found in Oudh, Rohilkhand and Gorakhpur, the legends on which give the names of kings ending in *mitra*, and these have consequently been rightly assigned to the Mitra dynasty.[146] The Gupta family is too well known to require any mention. All the kings of the Maukhari dynasty have their names ending in *varman*, and have, therefore, been styled also as the Varman dynasty.[147] Again, if these *śarmans* are mere name-endings, it is inconceivable how Varman could have found a place in their list. For *varman* is a suffix attached to the names of Kṣatriyas only, and cannot possibly be affixed to the names of Nāgar Brāhmaṇas, as they are Brāhmaṇas. But the very fact that Varman is included in the list shows that it is not a mere honorific suffix, but a family name, whose existence is attested by the Maukharis, also called Varman, and by the surname Barmā actually current in Bengal among the Kāyasthas.[148] Acharya has told us in one place that, at the time of performing religious ceremonies, it is customary to say Bhagvānlāla-trātā for Bhagvānlāl, Maṅiśaṅkargupta for Maṇiśaṅkar and so forth.[149] Here at any rate Trātā and Gupta cannot be taken as mere suffixes. For as suffixes they would be tautologous, as we have them already in *lāl* of Bhagvanlāl and *śaṅkar* of Maṇiśaṅkar.

---

[146] Rapson, *Indian Coins*, § 44 and 58; Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, p. 184.

[147] C. Mabel Duff, *The Chronology of India*, p. 308.

[148] The Kāyasthas of Bengal are, according to traditions, supposed to have come from Kanauj in the time of Ādiśūra (Risley, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 438). And that the Nāgars also come from the north will be shown further on. Nothing, therefore, goes against the view of their racial affinity, if not, identity. It is again worthy of note that the Śrīmālī Brāhmaṇas of Marwar also have no less than nine *śarmans* in common with the Nāgars; viz., Nanda, Trātaka, Mitra, Bhūta, Dāsa, Gupta, Ghoṣa, Datta and Deva (*Census Report of the Jodhpur State*, 1891, Vol. III, pp. 141-43). This shows that the Nāgar and Śrīmālī Brāhmaṇas and the Bengal Kāyasthas originally belonged to the same race. [There is no doubt that these family names are stereotyped name-endings of persons. See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 423-24. The development of the name of the Gupta dynasty took place before the days of the Maitrakas with whom the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas are associated Cf. also the name of the Pāla dynasty.—D. C. S.]

The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that at least ten of these *śarmans* represent the names of families or tribes that were incorporated into the Nāgar Brāhmaṇa caste. This seems to point to a racial identity or affinity between the Kāyasthas of Bengal and the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt.

If this line of reasoning has any weight, Mitra, one of the *śarmans* amongst the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas, really represents one of such tribes or clans amalgamated into that caste. And we have already seen that the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas first came to notice during the rule of the Valabhī kings who were Maitrakas. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, as I have stated elsewhere, that Maitraka and Mitra denote one and the same tribe, just as we know that the Solaṅkīs of Gujarāt have been called by one and the same poet at one time Cālukya and at another time Caulukya.

Besides the Mitras, there were, of course, as I have just stated, other families or tribes that were incorporated into the Nāgar Brāhmaṇa caste. In this connection the following learned words of James Campbell deserve to be noticed :—"The facts that there are Nāgaras among Gūjarāt Wāniās, that Nāgaras are 50,000 strong among the Gūrjaras of Bulandshahr (*N. W. P. Gazetteer*, III, 48), and that Nāgaras appear as Nagres among Jāṭs (*Sialkot Gazetteer*, 45) add to the doubt of the correctness of the Gujarāt Nāgara claim to be Brāhmaṇas."[150] The

---

[149] *Vienna Or. Journ.*, Vol. VII, p. 296.

[150] *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. IX, p. 438, note 9. [There are many places called Nagara, Nagarī or Purī which are the endings of bigger names like Mālavanagara, Madhyamikānagarī and Puruṣottamapurī. —D. C. S.]

Nāgars thus appear not to have been indigenous to Gujarāt, but came there from the north. When they did come to Gujarāt, they doubtless established themselves at Ānandapura or Vaḍnagar. It is in the Vaḍnagar *praśasti* of Kumārapāla (1143-1174 A.D.) that the place is for the first time called Nagara, and also the caste name Nāgara of these Brāhmaṇas mentioned. When Vīsnagar was founded and some of them settled there, the old place came to be called not simply Nagara, but Baḍā-Nagar, the old Nagar, which was Sanskritised into Vṛddhanagara as well as Vaṭanagara. I believe all their present sub-divisions, except one, are the offshoots of the first swarm of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas who were settled at Ānandapura. The exception is that of the Prasṇorās who, it is worthy of note, call themselves Ahicchātrā or Ahicchatrajñātīya.[151] This points to the conclusion that not only the Nāgars in Gujarāt, but even the Gūjar Nāgars of Bulandshahr and the Jāṭ Nagres were so named after some place called Nagar, which was not far from Ahicchatra. For, if this Nagar had not been in the close neighbourhood of Ahicchatra, the Nāgars and Prasṇorās would not have belonged to the same stock; and consequently the latter, when they emigrated from Ahicchatra and came to Gujarāt, would not have been admitted into the Nāgar caste. Now, there is such a place in the Sawālakh hills, called Nagar or Nagar-koṭ,[152] which was the old name of Kāṅgḍā, the principal town of the District of the same name, Panjab.

---

[151] *Ibid.*, Pt. I, p. 15, notes 1-2.

[152] The antiquities of Nagar-koṭ have been described by Cunningham in *Arch. Surv. Ind.*, Vol. V, pp. 155 ff. Nagar-koṭ is referred to and described by Hiuen-tsang (Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, Vol. I, pp. 187 ff.). Another name by which it was famous was Suśarmanagara (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 100; Vol. II, p. 483). Nagara, as the name of a town, was known to the author of the *Kāśikā* (see his gloss on Pāṇini, IV. 2. 95).

There is a temple of Devī here, which was one of the most ancient and famous shrines in Northern India, and was largely resorted to by pilgrims from the plains. The riches of the temple attracted the attention of Muḥammad of Ghaznī, who, in 1009 A.D., took the fort and plundered the temple. It is this Nagarkoṭ, I conjecture, that was like Ahicchatra, the cradle of a caste of the Brāhmaṇas called Nāgar or Nagar, who spread everywhere in India. Thus we have Nagar or Nāgar Brāhmaṇas not only in Gujarāt, but in Mysore and also in Nepāl. There are again subdivisions named Nāgar, Nagarī or Nagariā among the Kashmiri, Kanojia and Maithil Brāhmaṇas.[153]

Looked at even from the orthodox point of view, the present Nāgar Brāhmaṇa caste is a curious combination of Brāhmaṇic and non-Brāhmaṇic elements. Two of their *śarmans*, viz. Śarman and Deva, are, as laid down by the Smṛtis, name-suffixes of the Brāhmaṇas; one, viz., Varman, is that of the Kṣatriyas; two others, viz., Datta and Gupta are those of the Vaiśyas; and one, viz., Dāsa, of the Śūdras. All these elements, it may, therefore, be argued, combined to form the Nāgar caste. But the correct view appears to me to be to take all these *śarmans* as the names of tribes or clans that were amalgamated into the Nāgar caste, with more or less a Gurjara strain in it, as we have just seen. The following words are worth quoting in this connection from a letter from N. B. Divatia, Assistant Collector, Ratnāgiri: "Nor can it be argued against your theory of clan-indicators that, after all, these suffixes are merely individual name-suffixes like Lāl, Śaṅkar, Rām, Rāy, etc., in use amongst the Gujarātīs at present (e.g., Motilāl, Amṛtlāl, Mohanlāl, Premśaṅkar, Bhavānīśaṅkar, Mahīpatrām, Rūprām, Mukundrāy, Īśvarrāy, etc.), or amongst the Marāṭhās, and that, therefore, these *śarmans* are no more clan-indicators than are these Lāl, Rām, etc. For, while these Lāl, etc., pertain merely to individuals, each *śarman* was the peculiar property of a certain separate group of individuals, that group was wedded to that particular *śarman* in the matter of naming their members.

---

[153] Wilson, *Indian Caste*, Vol. II, pp. 61, 96, 148, 152.

"This principle has survived even the dropping of the *śarman* suffix, as is evidenced by the fact that the Nāgars, although they have not these suffixes tacked on to their names, now, are supposed to own particular hereditary *śarmans*. Thus, then, the invariable possession of a common *śarman* by a large number of families would naturally presuppose an underlying common basic idea, and that idea must be the clan, as it fits in all-round. You have noticed that, while the *śarmans* (e.g., Mitra, Gupta, Datta and others) have taken the place of surnames in Bengal, amongst the Nāgars they are only historical heritages, not used now for generations past, and, for surnames, the Nāgars have separate *avaṭaṁkas*. This also will indicate, in a way, that the *śarmans* at one time indicated more than a family. Thus the Bengal Kāyasthas reduced their *śarmans* to the position of surnames (just as the Scotch clan-names are now family names, i. e. surnames), whereas we Nāgars dropped the *śarmans* for all practical purposes, keeping them only as ornamental mementos of a social state long gone by, just like the *gotra*, and adopted the *avaṭaṁkas* for the surnames. Even the *avaṭaṁkas* would have disappeared from practice ; in fact they were not in daily use, till the University practice requiring surnames gave occasion for their revival, though of course the surnames were not as defunct as the *śarmans*. With regard to the presence of Śarman in the list of the thirteen *śarmans*, Divatia says as follows : "I think the terminal Śarman was claimed [as their peculiar *śarman*] by such of the Nāgars as had no real clan-indicating *śarman*, either because, having had one, it had long been forgotten or dropped, or because they did not probably descend from any definitive clan. An exact parallel of this process is at present found in the case of the surnames amongst the Nāgars. There are a certain number of families that possess no real surname at all, and, therefore, they have given themselves Mehtā as their surname; and, as all Nāgars know, Mehtā is a term applied to Nāgars in a general way, thus—Mehtā Nandśaṅkar, Mehtā Bāpūbhāi and so forth. This was the practice in addressing Nāgars in writing, now gone out of use, except in business account books."

I have proved elsewhere, conclusively I hope, that the Guhilots were originally Nāgar Brahmaṇas.[154] To this tribe belongs the celebrated Udaipur dynasty, looked upon as the purest Rājpūt family in the whole of Rajasthan. I have also shown there that the Guilots have been styled *Brahma-Kṣatrī* in one inscription and also in one bardic chronicle. The Sena kings of Bengal bore the same caste name. R. Narasimhachar of Bangalore has kindly drawn my attention to at least three such instances in the South. Thus Sravana-Belgola No. 109, of about 983 A.D., says that Cāmuṇḍarāya, the celebrated Jain minister of the Gaṅga king Rācamalla, belonged to the Brahma-Kṣatra family. The same fact is mentioned in the *Cāmuṇḍarāya Purāṇa* (978 A.D.) also. Udayāditya, a Gaṅga chief of the eleventh century, is described as of *Brahma-Kṣatra-vīr-ānvaya.*[155] Sirigirinātha Oḍeyar, governor of Āraga, under Devarāya II of Vijayanagar, was a Brahma-Kṣatra.[156] We have thus no less than five royal families that have been designated

---

[154] *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.*, 1909, pp. 167 ff.

[155] *Ep. Carnat.*, Vol. VII, Shikarpur Nos. 109, 110 and 130.

[156] *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII, Tirthahalla No. 23; here the phrase *Brahma-Kṣatriya* is used.

Brahma-Kṣatrī. The question here arises—what can be the meaning of this composite name, Brahma-Kṣatrī? I have elsewhere suggested that the Brahma-Kṣatrī denotes families which were Brāhmaṇas first, but afterwards exchanged their priestly for martial pursuits and were fused into the Kṣatriya class. I still maintain that this is at least one explanation. It is supported by the very nature of the compound *Brahm-Kṣatra*, which has to be dissolved as *ādau Brāhmaṇaḥ paścāt Kṣatraḥ*, i.e., those who were Brāhmaṇas first and became Kṣatriyas afterwards. The legends of the *Chīpā* caste in Marwar, to which allusion has been made elsewhere, also show that they came to be called Brahma-Kṣatrīs only after they gave up their Brāhmaṇa status for their new profession. But a second explanation is not impossible at least in some cases. It may be asserted that some families became Brahma-Kṣatrīs by intermarriages between the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya classes. We know that Haricandra, the progenitor of the feudatory Pratīhāra family, was a Brāhmaṇa, and had two wives, one a Brāhmaṇa and the other a Kṣatriya woman; offsprings from the first were styled Pratīhāra Brāhmaṇas, and from the latter Pratīhāra Kṣatriyas. We have a similar instance also, I think, in the case of the Kadambas. The founder of this family, as we have seen above, was Mayūraśarman. That he was a Brāhmaṇa is clearly shown by his honorific suffix *śarman* and by the actual use of the word *vipra* in the well-known Talagunda inscription. But his own son bears the designation of *varman* appropriate to a Kṣatriya only. This shows that Mayūraśarman too like Haricandra, must have married a Kṣatriya woman, and consequently was the originator of a Kṣatriya family. But, against this view, is the fact that the Pratīhāras and Kadambas are nowhere, in inscriptions or elsewhere, known as Brahma-Kṣatrīs. A third explanation also can be adduced with regard to the origin of this composite name. In the Purāṇas, we find at least two old royal families that are called Brahma-Kṣatra. Thus the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (Ch. 99, verses 278-79) has the following stanzas :

atr = ānuvaṁśa-śloko = 'yaṁ gīto vipraiḥ purāvidaiḥ |
Brahma-kṣatrasya yo yonir = vaṁśo devarṣi-satkṛtaḥ ||
Kṣemakaṁ prāpya rājānaṁ saṁsthāṁ prāpsyati vai Kalau |
ity = eṣa Pauravo vaṁśo yathāvad = anukīrtitaḥ ||

In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* occurs the following verse at the end of IV. 21 :

Brahma-Kṣatrasya yo yonir = vaṁśo rājarṣi-satkṛtaḥ |
Kṣemakaṁ prāpya rājānaṁ sa saṁsthāṁ prāpsyate Kalau ||

Here the Paurava family is called Brahma-Kṣatra, and with regard to its signification, the commentator on the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* says: *Brahmaṇaḥ Brāhmaṇasya Kṣatrasya Kṣatriyasya ca yoniḥ kāraṇaṁ pūrvaṁ yoth-oktatvāt.* This means that from the Paurava family emanated both the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya families. We know that the parents of Puru, who was the progenitor of the Pauravas, were Yayāti and Śarmiṣṭhā, both unquestionably of the Kṣatriya caste. Hence the question will naturally arise, how and what Brāhmaṇa families could have sprung from Puru ? The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (IV. 19. 9-10 and 16) answers it. Here we have *Gargāc = Chinis = tato Gārgyāḥ Śainyāḥ Kṣatr-opetā dvijātayo babhūvuḥ... Ajamīḍhāt = Kaṇvaḥ Kaṇvān = Medhātithir = yataḥ Kāṇvāyanā dvijāḥ...Mudgalāc = ca Kṣatr-opetā dvijātayo babhūvuḥ.* The expression *kṣatr-opetā dvijātayo babhūvuḥ* is explained in the commentary by *Kṣatriyā eva kenacit kāraṇena Brāhmaṇāś = ca babhūvuḥ.* From these quotations, it is clear that no less than four Brāhmaṇic families originated from Puru, viz., Gārgya, Śainya, Kāṇvāyana and Maudgalya. This is the reason why the Paurava family is styled Brahma-Kṣatra. Yayāti and Śarmiṣṭhā had also another son called Anu. One of his descendants called Vijaya is sopken of as a Brahma-Kṣatra. The verse in the *Harivaṁśa* [I. 31. 56.—D. C. S.] runs thus—

Jayadrathas=tu rājendra Yaśodevyāṁ vyajāyata |
Brahma-Kṣatr-ottaraḥ satyāṁ Vijayo nāma viśrutaḥ ||

The prose passage in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, corresponding to it, is: *Brahma - Kṣatr - āntarāla - saṁbhūtyāṁ*[157] *patnyāṁ Vijayaṁ nāma putram = ajījanat*. The passage is explained by the commentator in the following words:

prātilomyena Brahma-Kṣatrayor = antarāle saṁbhūtir = janma yasyāḥ tasyāḥ sutāyāṁ patnyām | Brāhmaṇyāṁ Kṣatriyāj = jātaḥ Sūta iti smṛteḥ | ato mātṛvad-varṇa-saṁkarā iti vacanād = Vijayaḥ Sūta eva | ataś = ca Karṇo = 'pi tad-vaṁśyatvāt = Sūtatvena khyātaḥ |

There is a little confusion in the commentary here; but what the commentator means is that Vijaya's mother's mother was born of a Kṣatriya father and Brāhmaṇa mother, and that he is, therefore, called Brahma-Kṣatra, i.e., Sūta, after the caste of his mother. This explains, he says, why Karṇa also, who was brought up by Adhiratha, a descendant of Vijaya, was called 'son of the Sūta.' I do not know whence the commentator obtained his information regarding the origin of Vijaya's mother. The fact was probably something like this: In the *Harivaṁśa* (I.1776) we are told that Bṛhanmanas, father of Vijaya, had two wives named Yaśodevī and Satyā, both daughters of Vainateya. And from Satyā sprang Vijaya. Vainateya, being a son of Kaśyapa, was a Brāhmaṇa; the queens of Bṛhanmanas were consequently Brāhmaṇa girls. Vijaya had thus for his father a Kṣatriya and for his mother a

---

[157] In the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, *Sambhūti* is given as the name of Vijaya's mother. But this is a mistake. His mother's name was Satyā, as given by the *Harivaṁśa* and *Vāyu Purāṇa*.

Brāhmaṇī, and was thus a Brahma-Kṣatra. There can be little doubt that something derogatory is here implied, as is clearly shown by the term *sūta* which is applied to Adhiratha in I. 1709. Thus we see that, even in the old Purāṇas, the meaning of the phrase Brahma-Kṣatra was not definitely settled, and that at one place it is applied to a Kṣatriya dynasty from which Brāhmaṇa families sprang up and at another to princes, one of whose forefathers, although a Kṣatriya, married a Brāhmaṇa woman. There can, however, be no doubt, I think, as to the sense in which the expression is used in inscriptions. It is applied, as I have stated above, to families that were Brāhmaṇa first, but became Kṣatriya afterwards.[158]

To sum up what we have said so far, there is hardly a class or caste in India, which has not a foreign strain in it. There is an admixture of alien blood not only amongst the warrior classes—the Rājpūts and the Marāṭhās, but also amongst the Brāhmaṇas who are under the happy delusion that they are perfectly free from all foreign elements. If the Brāhmaṇas have not escaped this taint, as we have seen, and yet call themselves Brāhmaṇas, it excites the risibility of the antiquarian or the ethnologist when he finds some Brāhmaṇa castes strenuously calling question the claims of certain warrior classes to style themselves Kṣatriyas. The grounds of this strenuous opposition, as stated by the Brāhmaṇa castes, are that pure unmixed Vedic Aryan blood does not run through the veins of those warrior classes. This is quite true; but it is equally true that pure Vedic Aryan blood does not run through the veins of the Brāhmaṇas also. Looked at from the antiquarian or ethnological point of view, the claims of either community to such a purity are untenable and absurd. As the chief thing valued by the members of the higher castes, viz., purity of blood, i.e., absence of any admixture of aboriginal or foreign blood, has been proved to be hollow and nonexistent, the caste jealousies and controversies, which cause immense mischief, are really useless and meaningless. It is to be sincerely hoped that the knowledge furnished by ethnology and the study of ancient inscriptions will spread among the people, and open their eyes to the emptiness and worthlessness of the thing they are fighting for, and put an end to all caste animosities and disputes, which are the bane of India.

---

[158] [It is quite clear from the evidence at our disposal that the Brahma-Kṣatriya was one who could claim both the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya blood in his veins. See Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā*, pp. 6 ff.—D. C. S.]

INDEX

Ābhīra 19-22; Brāhmaṇa 22
Ābhīravāṭaka 20
Abhona 30
Abuhola 15
Abu Zaid 34
Ācārya 60; Vallabhji Haridatta 57
Adeisathra 49
Adeisathroi 49
Adhiratha 68-69
Adisdara (Adisadra) 49
Ādiśūra 60n
Ādityadāsa 27
Afghanistan 14
Agnihotra sacrifice 47
Agnikula, 39, 41, 54; myth 40n
agnikuṇḍa 41
Agnivarman 19-20
Agra 28
agrahāra 47
Āhalladevī 33
Ahicchatra 44, 46-49, 52-53, 62-63; Brāhmaṇa 52
Ahicchātrā 62
Ahicchatrajñātīya 62
Ahicchatrapura 48
Ahicchatra-viṣaya 49n
Ahihaya-vaṁśa 30
Āhīr 20, 22; Sonār 22; Sutār 2
Āhirānī dialect 22
Āhīrwār 20
Ahraurā 22
Aihole 55
Aiwyāonghen 25
Aja 15n
Ajamīḍha 4-5
Ajmer 50
Al-Bīrūnī 33 & n, 36n
Alexander of Epirus 9
Alikasundara 9
Alīnā 58
Al-Masudī 34
Alwar State 33
Ambādās 59
Amṛtalāl 63
Aṁtikini 9
Aṁtiyoka 9
Ānandapura 58-59, 62
Ānartapura 58
Andhrabhṛtya dynasty 20
Andhra Pradesh 19n
Antalikita, Antialkidas 14
Antigonus Gonatas 9
Antiochus I Soter 9; II Theos 9n
Anu 67
Anuloma marriage 3
Apollodotus 10n, 11
Apte, V. S. 38n
Arab—geographers 42; travellers 34
Āraga 65
Arghandāb 55
Arjuna 20
Aruṇa (god) 24
Āśādhara 50n
Āśāpurī (goddess) 43
Asia 54
Asof 54
Aśoka 9
Aśokavalla 49
Ātreya 58
Aufrect 53n
Aurva-Bhārgava 28
Avantisundarī 45
avyaṅga 25, 28
Ayodhyā 10n, 41
Azas (Azes) 14n, 15 & n

Babur (Mughul emperor) 50
Bactria, Bactriana 10, 11n

Baḍā-Nagar 62
Badāūn 48
Badeghiz 55
Baḍ-Gūjar (Birgujar) 36
Bagalkot Taluka 47
Baghdad 56
Bāhaka 22
Bāhmanwāsi-Brāhmaṇābad 42
Bāhu 28
Bāhuka 39
Baid-Kāyastha community 53n
Balarāma 21
Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa 48n
Bāṇa 55
Banda District 29
Bangalore 51n, 65
Barmā (Varman) 59-60
Baroda State 30
Barygaza 10n, 11
Bazāna 33
Beal, 5, 34n, 48
Beas 49, 52n
Bengal 22, 24, 26n, 27, 31n, 34, 36, 39n, 59n, 69n, 60-61, 64-65
Berlin 48n
Besnagar 13
Bhāgabhadra 14
Bhāgavata 14
Bhāgavata Purāṇa 2, 68n
Bhagavatī (goddess) 37 & n
Bhagvānlāl 60-61
Bhagvānlāla-trātā 60
Bhairanmaṭṭi 47
Bhandarkar, R. G. 17
Bhāradvāja 58
Bhārgava 2
Bharukaccha 11
Bhaṭārka 56-57
Bhāṭī, Bhāṭī-Māli 53
Bhaṭṭ-Otpala 27
Bhava 57
Bhavānīśaṅkar 63
Bhaviṣya Purāṇa 24-27
Bhinmāl 34
Bhogāvatī (town) 47
Bhoja I 33
Bhojak, Bhojaka 25, 27
Bhṛgu 57
Bhūt, Bhūta 57-59, 60n
Bihar 24n, 31, 39, 41
Bijapur District 47
Bijjala 29
Bijolia 44
Bilhaṇa 40
Birje 31n, 41n
Bombay Presidency 33, 35, 39, 47
Brahma-Kṣatra 65-69
Brahma-Kṣatrī 65-66
Brahma-Kṣatriya 65, 69n
Brāhmaṇa 1-9, 16-17, 24-27, 31, 35-40, 44-48, 52, 56, 58-63, 66, 68, 69 & n; *gotra* 6; Pratīhāras 38-39
Brāhmaṇism 32
Brahmarṣi 6n
Brāhmī script 11 & n
Bṛhanmanas 68
Bṛhatkṣatra 4
Bṛhatsaṁhitā 26, 56
British Museum 10n
Broach 10n, 11
Buddha 15, 23
Buddharāja 30
Buddhism 11-13, 15
Buddhists 13, 15
Bühler 18
Bulandshahr 61-62
Bundelkhand 29
Bundi 20
Byzantium 56

Cāhamāna 41, 43; 50-54; dynasty 44, 48
caitya 13
Cakrapāṇi 27
Calcutta 11n, 23n, 32n, 60n
Calhuk 41
Cāḷke 41

Cālukya 30, 39-41, 46, 51-53, 61; dynasty 29
Campbell, James 36, 54-55, 61
Cāmuṇḍarāya 65
Cāmuṇḍarāya Purāṇa 65
Caṇḍāla 6
Candrabhāgā river 25 & n
Candragupta 9
Caṣṭana 17
Caucasus 55
Caūhāna (Cāhamāna) 45
Caulukya 39-41, 54, 61
Cavān 33, 54, 56
Cavhān 56
Cedi 31-32
Central India 32, 35, 36n;
Central Provinces 31
Chāhamā 56
Chamba State 50, 53
Chenab 25n, 48
Chīpā Caste 66
Ciṭa 12
Citoḍ 10
Citramukha 6n
Cohān 20, 56
Colebroke 27n
Coorg 47n
Cunnigham 15, 25n, 44, 48-49, 51-52, 62n
Cyrene 9n

Da Cunha 47n
Dakhan families 36
Dāmacika 19
Daṇḍin 22
Das, Dāsa 57, 59, 60n, 63
Daśapura 19
Datta (surname) 57-60, 63-64
Dattāmitra (town) 13
Daulatpurā 33
Deb, Deva (surname) 59
Deccan 15-17, 20, 22
Dekkan (Deccan) 17n
Delhi 28
Demetrius 10n, 13
Deva (surname) 57, 60n, 63
Devarāya II 65
Devī 63
Deviprasad 28n, 50
Dharasena 57
Dharmadeva 13
Dharmāmṛta 50n
Dharaṇendra 47
Dharwar District 46, 51
Dhenukākaṭa 12
Dhruvasena I 58
Ḍīḍwānā 33
Ḍion 14
Dīnīka 16
Divatia, N. B. 63-64
Divine Mothers 40
Diya 13-14
Drāviḍa stock 36n
Duff, Mabel C. 60n.
Dvārakā, Dwarka 21
Dvimīḍha 4

Earth (goddess) 46
Egypt 9
Elliot 31n.
Epirus 9
Epthalite 32; coin 56
Europe 54

Fleet 29, 32n, 56n, 58n

Gaḍhwāl 50, 52n
Gaṇapaka 19-20
Gaṅga king 65
Gaṅgādhara 27
Ganges 49 & n
Gangetic plains 48
Gāṅgyāyana 58
Gardner, Percy 10n
Gārgīsaṁhitā 10n
Gārgya 59, 67
Garta clan 12
Garuḍa-dhvaja 13-14
Gauḍ, Gauḍa (tribe) 36 & n; Brāhmaṇas 35, 36n; Rājpūt 36n

Gauramukha 25
Gautamīputra Ṣātakarṇi 17-18
Gayā 49; District 24 & n
Gazar 54-55
Ghaznī 55
Ghaṭiyālā 21, 26
Ghoṣa 57, 59, 60n
Ghsāmotika 17
Ghusar 55
Ghyssr 54-55
Gondophares 14n
Gorakhpur 60
Govinda (man) 37
Govindapur 24, 26-27
Greek—people 9, 10, 13-14, 23; alphabet 41; kings 10n; language 11; prince 10
Grierson 53-54
Guḍa-Tāneshar 36n
Guha 58
Guhila 40n, 69n
Guhilot 44, 57n, 65
Gujar, Gūjar 33-35, 37, 39, 41, 54-55; kings 38; Kuṇbīs 35
Gūjar-Gauḍ 35
Gujaristān 55
Gujarānwālā 33
Gujarat 22, 29, 33, 36-37, 39-40, 61-63; Kaṇbīs 35; Nāgara 61; Wāniā 61
Gujarat (District) 33
Gujarātī—language 22; people 63
Gujrat-Malwa region 31
Gūjarī 54
Gunda 21
Guntur District 19n
Gupta (surname) 57, 59-63
Gupta—dynasty 31, 60 & n; era 31; inscriptions 32n ; power 32
Gupta-Valabhī era 58
Gurjara, 32-34, 36-37, 55-56, 61, 63
Gurjaradeśa 51, 55
Gurjara-Pratīhāra 34-35
Gurjara-rāṣṭra 33
Gurjaratrā 33, 40
Gūrjar Nāgar community 62
Gurjistān 55
Guṣaṇa 14n
Gwalior 13, 17, 19, 38

Hāḍā 20
Hāḍījī 20
Haiga 47
Haihaya clan 28-31
Haihayavaṅś 31
Hammīra-mahākāvya 44n
Hana 15
Hānsi 50
Haricandra 38, 66
Harihobans 31
Hārītīputra 40, 45-46
Harivaṁśa 5, 28-29, 31, 68 & n
Harṣacarita 55
Hastī 4
Hastināpura 4
Haviga (Havika) Brāhmaṇa 47 & n, 52
Hayobansas 31
Hayuara 15
Hazārā 55
Heliodora (Heliodorus) 13-14
Himalayas 41, 46, 48-49, 51, 53
Himavat 46
Hindu 3, 6, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 32, 34, 37; castes 3; customs 46; law 3, 7; legislators 3; population 3, 35; society 1, 3, 7, 9, 36n
Hinduism 3, 13, 32
Hindukush 10, 50
Hiuen-tsang 34, 48-49, 55, 62n
Hoshiarpur 50, 52n; District 52
Hultzsch 43n, 57n
Hūṇa 26n 32-33, 41, 44, 52, 55-56
Huviṣka 23

Ibbetson 35n, 53n
Ikṣvāku 19n

India 10n, 11n, 14, 20, 25-28, 31 & n, 33 & n, 38, 48n, 55-57, 60, 63, 69-70; East 2n; North 22, 28, 32, 48, 57, 63; North-West 41; South 2 & n, 30-31, 56; West 12, 29
Indian coins 17n, 42 & n
Indian Museum 11n, 23n, 32n,
Indo-Parthian 14n
Indo-Scythia 14n
Indrāgnidatta 13
Indus 47, 50, 52n; Delta 11
Ionian 9
Irila 12
Isamus (Jamunā) 11
Īśvarasena 19, 21
Īśvarrāy 63

Jackson, A.M.T. 36-37
Jagadīśa (god) 28
Jain 65
Jaipur 28, 33; State 36n
Jalagambu 24n
Jamunā 10-11, 49n
Jāṅgala 48
Jaraśabda 24n, 25
Jaraśasta 2n, 25-26
Jarathustra 25
Jaswal 53
Jaswantpurā District 34
Jāṭ—people, 61; Negres 62
Jāulistān 51n, 52n
Jayadāman 17
Jayadratha 68
Jayasiṁha II 28
Jew community 55
Jhānsī 20
Jīmūtavāhana 56
Jambudvīpa 25
Jodhpur 21, 28n, 33, 38-39, 50; State 27, 33-34, 39n, 53n, 60n
Jujr kings 34
Junagadh 18
Junnar 16; caves 12
Jvālāmukhī (goddess) 28

Kabul 50
Kacch 22
Kacchāra 56
Kadamba 40, 45-46, 48, 52, 66
Kaḍwā community 35
Kakkuka 21, 26
Kalacuri clan 28-31
Kālañjara (Kāliñjar) 29, 33
Kalatsuri 30
Kali-yuga 2, 7, 26
Kalyāṇakaṭaka 40
Kalyāṇī (town) 29, 40
Kāma (country) 49
Kamboja people 28-29
Kammarawadi 30
Kanauj 33, 35, 37, 40, 60n
Kaṅgavarman 46
Kāṅgḍā 50, 52n, 62
Kanheri 18
Kaniṣka 14n, 23, 26-27
Kanojia 63
Kaṇva 4-5
Kāṇvāyana 67
Kānyakubja 49n
Kārdamaka 18
Kargudari 46
Karhāḍā (Karhāḍe) Brāhmaṇa 36-37
Kārlī 16; caves 12
Karṇa 68
Karṇasundarī 40 & n
Karpūramañjarī 38n, 44
Kārtavīrya-Arjuna 29-30
Kashmir 32, 50, 54
Kashmiri 63
Kāśikā 49n, 62n
Kāśyapa 37, 68
Kaṭaccuri 30
Kathiawad 10-11, 15-17, 21-22
Katoch 53
Kauṁkaṇa-deśa 37
Kaurava 6n
Kauśika-gotra 4
Kāvyādarśa 22
Kāyastha 59-61, 64; Prabhu 31
Keralotpatti 52

Keśadhara 56n
Khacara 56& n
Khandesh 22, 29, 35
Kharoṣṭhī script 11n
Khasa people 28
Khazar 44, 54-56
Khijara 56
Khshathrapāvan 16
Khusrū II Parvīz 42, 44
Kikkaka 59
Kiṣikindhā 40n, 69n
Kiu-che-lo 34
Konkan 36
Konow 38n
Kramadīśvara 13n
Kṛṣṇa (god) 21, 25
Kṣaharāta 16-17
Kṣatrapa 15-18
Kṣatriya 1-6, 20, 21, 28, 31-32, 34, 37-38, 44-46, 60, 63, 66-67, 68, 69, 69n; Pratīhāra 39
Kujula Kadphises 22-23
Kumāra (Komaro) 23
Kumārapāla 62
Kumaun 49-50, 52n
Kumbhār 35
Kuntala 46
Kuṣāṇa clan 22, 28, 31
Kusulaka 15

Lacchukā 34
Lacchukeśvara 34
Ladnu 51n
Lakṣmaṇa 38
Lāl 63-64
Lanman 38n
Lāṭa 40
Lesghian people 55
Lewā community 35
Liaka 15

Maaseno (Mahāsena) 23n
Macdonell 36n
Macedonia 9
Madhyamikā 10
Madras Presidency 40
Mādreya 48
Magadha 27
Maga—community 9 ; Brāhmaṇa 24-27
Magi 25
Mahābhārata 4-6, 20, 26, 29, 31, 48-49
Mahābhāṣya 10, 13
Mahākṣatrapa 15, 18-19
Mahākūṭa 30
Mahāpadma-Nanda 2
Maharashtra 18, 31, 36-37
Mahāsena 23
Mahāyāna 23
Mahendra mountain 31
Mahendrapāla 37, 45
Maheśvara 23
Mahīdhara 52
Mahīpāla 37
Mahīpāla-Vināyakapāla 45
Mahīpatrām 63
Māhiṣmatī 29-30
Maithil Brāhmaṇa 63
Maitraka clan 32, 56-57, 60-61
Majumdar, R. C. 40n
Maka 9
Malwa 13, 15-17, 29
Manaswal Plateau 52
Mānavya-gotra, Mānavya-sagotra 40, 45-46
Maṇḍalākara-durga (Maṇḍalgaḍh) 50n, 51n
Maṇḍalgaḍh 50
Mandasaur 19, 32
Māndhātā 29
Mandor 50
Maṅgaleśa 30
Maṇiśaṅkar 59-61
Maṇiśaṅkargupta 60
Manoratha 27
Mantramahodadhi 52 & n
Manu 8-9
Manusmṛti 1, 8
Marāṭhā—people 31 & n, 41n, 64; family 36

Marāṭhī 22; adage 6; language 41
Marwar 50, 60n
Mathanadeva 34
Māṭharī-putra 21
Mathurā 14-15, 21 ; Lion-capital inscription 14n, 15
Mātṛravi 26
Maudgalya-gotra 67
Manes 15n
Maukhari dynasty 60
Maurya dynasty 9-10
Mayūra (king) 39
Mayūraśarman 45-46, 48, 52, 66
Mayūravarman 47n
Medhātithi 4-5, 67
Meghanāda 38
Mehta 65 ; Bāpūbhāi 65; Nandśaṅkar 65
Mewar 44, 50, 51n
Menaṁdra, Menander 10-11
Mer people 57
Mihira 25-27, 57
Mihira-gotra 25
Mihirakula 32
Mihr 25
Mihrgul 32
Milinda (Menander) 11
Milindapañha 11
Mirzapur District 20
Mitākṣarā 7
Mitra (Sun) 57
Mitra (surname) 57-61, 64
Mitra dynasty 60
Mitravana 25n
Mleccha 20, 29
Moa (Maues) 14n, 15 & n
Mohanlāl 63
Mongolian 24
Motīlāl 63
Mount Abu 41
Muḥammad of Ghaznī 63
Muir 4, 5
Mukaṇṇa-Kadamba 46
Mukundrāy 63
Mūltān 25n, 42
Mysore 47 & n, 63

Nābhāgariṣṭha 5
Nadasi-Kasa 15
Nāga (tribe) 47
Nāgabhaṭa 37
Nāgadatta 57
Nāgapattana 51n
Nagara 57-65
Nāgar Brāhmaṇa 44, 57-63, 65
Nagarī 10, 61n
Nagaria 63
Nāgarī character 41-42
Nāgārjunikoṇḍa valley 19n
Nagar-koṭ 62-63
Nāgasena 11
Nagaur District 51n
Nahapāna 16
Nakṣubhā 24n
Nanda (surname) 57, 59, 60n
Nanda dynasty 2
Nandī (surname) 59
Nandin (divinity) 23
Nārada 25
Narasimhachar, R. 51n, 65
Narasiṁhagupta Bālāditya 32
Narmadā (river) 29
Nāsik 16, 19-21, 29; caves 13; District 30
Nawada 24
Nepal 26, 50, 53, 63
Nidhruva-gotra 37
Nikṣubhā 24n, 25
Nimar District 29
Niṣādī 7
Nizam's Dominions 30
Nūtana-Kālidāsa 27

Oḍeyar 65
Oesho 23
Ojhe (Ojha) 37
O-hi-chi-ta-lo 48-49
Osvāl Śrāvak 27
Oudh 10n, 60

Pabhosā 49
Paḍihār 39, 41, 53-54
Paḍiyāriyā 39
Pādrā 30
Pahāḍī language 53-54
Pahlava 28
Pakhli 50
Pāli language 11
Pallava 45
Pallipura (Pāli) 51n
Pampa-Bhārata 51 & n
Paṁvār 64
Pañcāla 49 & n
Pañcatantra 51n
Paṇḍe 28
Pāṇini 10n, 49n, 62n
Panjab 10, 14-15, 21, 33, 35 & n, 50, 52n, 53 & n
Panjtar 14n
Pārada people 28-29
Parama-Bhagavatī-bhakta 37
Parama-māheśvara 37
Paramāra 41, 53-54
Parama-vaiṣṇava 37
Parāśara 6 & n
Parāśarī Brāhmaṇa 28
Pāraśava 8
Paraśurāma 2, 31, 52
Parbatsar 33
Pārvatī (goddess), 37 & n
Pātāla 47
Patalene 11
Patañjali 10 & n
Pathania 53
Patika 14n, 15
Paṭṭavardhana 37
Paurava 67
Pavār 33
Periplus 10n, 11, 14n
Perma-Jagadekamalla II 30
Persia 9, 25
Persian conquerors 42
Pi-lo-mo-lo 34
Plutarch 11
Pokarṇā Brāhmaṇa 39
Poona 12
Prabhāsa 16-17
Prabandhakoṣa 43-44, 50
Prācya country 49n
Prasiake 49
Praṣṇorā 62
Pratīhāra 34-35, 38-39, 46, 66; Brāhmaṇa 66; dynasty 21, 37; Kṣatriya 66
Pratiloma marriage 3
Pravarādhyāya 57-59
Premśaṅkar 63
Pṛthvīrāja 56
Pṛthīrājarāsā 41
Pṛthvīrājavijaya 43
Ptolemy 14n, 49
Ptolemy Philadelphus 9
Pūjārī 25, 28
Pulikāla 47
Puramīḍha, Purumīḍha 4
Purāṇa 67, 69
Purī 61n
Puru 67
Puruṣottamasiṁha 49
Pushkar 28

Rācamalla 65
Raghu 38
Rājanya 11
Rājaśekhara 38 & n, 44, 49n
Rājaśekhara-Sūri 43, 50
Rajastan 15, 22, 34-37, 39, 39n, 41, 51, 52n, 53-55, 65
Rājasthānī language 53-54
Rājataraṅgiṇī 32, 52
Rājkoṭ 57
Rājor 34-35
Rājpūt 20, 31, 33, 36, 53-54, 56, 69; family 65; tribe 39
Rājula 15
Rām (surname) 63-64
Rāma 38
Rāmabhadra 37-38
Rāmnagar 48-49
Rapson 17, 42 & n, 44, 60n
Rāṣṭrakūṭa 34
Ratanpur 29, 31

Rāṭhoḍ 20
Ratnāgiri 63
Rawlins 52
Rāwat (Raut) 37
Rāy 63
Rebhārī 33
Rebhila 19
Revarasa 30
Ṛgveda 1, 3-5
Rice 47n, 51n
Risley 31n, 39n, 41n, 59n, 60n
Ṛjihva 24n, 25-26
Ṛjvāhva 24n
Rock Edict XIII 9
Rohilkhand 60
Rohilladdhi 38
Rohinsakūpaka 21
Ṛṣabhadatta 16-17
Ṛṣi 6
Rudra (king) 18
Rudrabhūti 22
Rudradāman 17-19, 22
Rudrasiṁha 22
Rūprām 63

Sachau 33n
Ṣaḍānana (god) 40
Śaduktikarṇāmṛta 27
Sagara 28
Sahasrārjuna 31
Sahmanak 50
Sahya 31
Sahyādrikhaṇḍa 47n
Ṣainya 67
Ṣaiva 23
Ṣaka 14n, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 28-29: dynasty 14n, 15; era 14n, 22, 24; kings 14, 14n, 19, 26n; *Kṣatrapa* 18
Ṣāka-dvīpa 24-25
Ṣākadvīpī Brāhmaṇa 24, 24n, 27-28
Ṣākambharī 50n
Ṣākambharī (goddess) 43
Ṣakānikā 19-21
Sakastana 14n
Sāketa 10
Salāṭ 35
Ṣālivāhana 17-18
Sālunke 41
Sāmanta 44, 48
Sāmba 24-25
Sāmbapura 25n
Sāmbhar 50n
Sambhūti 68 n
Saṅgha 12
Saṅghamitā (Saṅghamitrā) 16 & n
Ṣaṅkar (name-suffix) 63
Ṣaṅkaragaṇa 30
Saṅkṣiptasāra 13 n
Sanskrit—literature 3, 16, 26n; texts 4
Sapādalakṣa 42-43, 49-54, 56; country 41
Sapādalakṣīya-Cāhamāna 50
Sapardalakshān 43, 51, 52n
Saraostos 11
Ṣarkarākṣa, Ṣārkarākṣi, *gotra* 58
Ṣarmā (surname) 57, 59
Ṣarman 63
Ṣarmiṣṭhā 67
Sarsavni 30
Sassanian dynasty 42
Sassanian Pahlavī 41-42, 44
Ṣateraka 18
Ṣātavāhana 17-18; dynasty 18
Satra 15-16
Satyā 68 & n
Satyavatī 6n
Sauvīra 13
Savālakh (Sawālakh) 40, 52, 62
Sawālakh 50
Sawālakhiā 53 & *n*
Scythia 14n
Scythic kings 10n
Scytho-Sassanian rulers 41
Sena dynasty 65
Sevak 27-28
Shāhḍherī 15
Shikarpur 65n
Shimoga District 47
Sīhadhaya 12n

Siṁhadhayya, Siṁhadhairya 12
Siṁhadhvaja 12n
Sind 13, 42
Sinda clan 47-48, 52
Sindhia 17
Sindhu (river) 47
Sircar, D. C. 40n, 60n, 69n
Sirigirinātha 65
Sīstān 14n
Sītāpatrī 28
Śiva (god) 23, 32, 37, 46
Śivadatta 21
Siwalik range 49
Skanda 23
Skandatrāta 58
Smith, V. A. 9n, 10n, 11n, 14, 23n, 32n, 52, 56, 60n
Smṛti 7, 39
Śoḍāsa 14n
Solaṅkī 40-41, 54, 61
Someśvara I 30
Somnāth-paṭṭan 17
Sonār 22, 35
Spalagadames 15, 16
Spalahores 15
Spalirises 15
Sravana-Belgola 65
Śrīdharadāsa 27
Śrīmālī Brāhmaṇ 60n
Śrī-Prakāśāditya 55
Śrī-Vahamana 42, 43
Śrī-Vāsudeva 42
Śrī-Vāsudeva-Vahamana 42
Śrī-Vatsa 44n
Stein 52n
Sthāṇugūḍhapura 47
Strabo 10
stūpa 12, 15
Śūdra 1-3, 7-8, 63
Śūdrakamalākara 2
Suhotra 4
Sujihva 24n
Śuṅga dynasty 10
Sun-god 24
Surāṣṭra 11
Sūrya (god) 25-27
Sūryavaṁśī Rājpūt 31
Suśarmanagara 62n
Sūta 68
Sutār 22
Sutlej 48
Svālakh (Savālakh) 51n
Śvamukha 56n
Swat valley 54
Syamaldas 44n
Syria 9

Takān 25n
Takht-i-Bahī 14n
Takṣaśilā 15
Ṭāk-Ṭakka 52n
Talagunda 45-47, 66
Taxila 14n, 15
Ṭhāneśvar 36
Thomas, F. W. 14n
Tirthahalla 65n
Tod, 36n, 39n
Toramāṇa 32
Traikūṭaka 31 & n
Trāta 57-58
Trātā 61
Trātaka 60n
Tripurī 29
Tukān 43, 51, 52n
Turamāya 9
Turkish 24

Uccakalpa 31; kings 31n
Udaipur—dynasty 65; State 10
Udayāditya 65
Ujjain 52
Ujjayanī, Ujjayinī 17, 30
Ujaristān 55
U.P. 48, 20, 29, 31, 35, 48
Urvaśī 6
Uṣavadāta 17

Vaḍnagar 58, 62
Vahamana 42-43
Vainateya 68
Vaiṣṇava 14
Vaiśya 1-6, 63

Valabhī 59; dynasty 56-67; kings 61
Vālmīki 27
Vāṇiā 35
Varāhamihira 26-27, 56 & n
Varmā, Varman 57, 59
Varman dynasty 60
Vasant-ācārya 52
Vasiṣṭha 5-6, 28, 41
Vasiṣṭha-gotra 5
Vāsiṣṭhīputra Puḷumāyi 17
Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī-Śātakarṇi 18
Vāsudeva (god) 13
Vāsudeva (king of Multan) 43-44, 51 & n
Vāsudeva-Cāhamāna 43
Vasuṣeṇa 19n
Vaṭanagara 62
Vatsa-gotra 44-45
Vatsarāja 37
Vatsa-ṛṣi 45
Vavadiya-jogia 58
Vāyu Purāṇa 67, 68n
Veda 3, 6
Vedic Aryan 69
Vidyāpati 40
Vienna 43n, 58n, 61n
Vijaya 68
Vijayanagar 65
Vijñāneśvara-bhaṭṭa 7-8
Vikramāditya VI 30
Vikrama era 14n, 21, 26, 43-44
Vikramāṅkadevacarita 40
Vikrama Saṁvat 57
Viśākha (Bizago) 23
Vīsnagar 62
Viṣṇu (god) 37
Viṣṇudatta 19
Viṣṇudattā 19-21
Viṣṇu Purāṇa 4, 20 & n, 28 & n, 67-68
Viśvāmitra 4
Viśvavarman 19
Vonones 14n
Vṛddhaka 19
Vṛddhanagara 62
Vṛṣabhadatta 16
Vudhika 19
Vyāghrapāṭaka 34
Vyāsa 6 & n

Watters 62n
Weber 24n, 48n
Wema Kadphises 22-23
White Hun 32, 55; coins 52
Wilson 22n, 63n

Yādava 21
Yājñavalkya 8-9
Yājñavalkyasmṛti 7-8
Yānemarasa 30
Yaśaḥkarṇa 32
Yaśodevī 68
Yaśodharman 32
Yavana 9-14, 28-29
Yavana-dūta 14
Yāyāvara 45
Yayāti 67
Yugapurāṇa 10n
Yona-rāja 9

Zabulistan 42-43
Zoroaster 25

294.5
R469J